

THE CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

FUND: PAST EXPERIENCE AND FUTURE OPTIONS

By Colin Hoskins* and Stuart McFadyen**

Final Report Submitted to the Task Force on
Broadcasting Policy, January, 1986

*Professor, Department of Marketing and Economic Analysis, Faculty of
Business, University of Alberta.

**Professor and Chairman, Department of Marketing and Economic Analysis,
Faculty of Business, University of Alberta.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The Economic Background	2
3. The Technological and Regulatory Environment	8
4. The Fund in the Context of the New National Broadcasting Strategy of 1983	12
5. The Original Guidelines for the Fund	14
6. The Experience of the Fund during the First 21 Months	17
(a) Production Volume	18
(b) Allocation of Funding between Private and Public Broadcasters	21
(c) Private Broadcaster Participation in French-language Projects	22
(d) Private Broadcaster Participation in English-language Projects	24
(e) Financial Sources and their Relative Importance	25
(f) Financial Experience	28
7. The Changes in Guidelines for Fund Effective April 1, 1985	32
8. The Experience with the Fund from April 1, 1985	34
(a) Production Volume and Program Category	34
(b) Financial Sources and their Relative Importance	36
(c) Funding of Continuing Series	39
(d) Audience Ratings of Fund Projects	40
9. Regional Balance	40
10. Interviews	48
(a) Confusion over the Mandate of Telefilm Canada	48
(b) CBC	49
(c) Evaluative Comments on Telefilm Canada	50
(d) Categories of Programs Funded	51
(e) Regional Balance	52
(f) Rules versus Authority	53
(g) Assessment of Needs for Changes in the Fund	56
11. Economic Rationale for a Subsidy through Telefilm Canada	61

12. Policy Recommendations	66
(a) A Two-Tier level of Telefilm Canada Funding with the First Tier Phased out after Several Years	66
(b) Restructuring of the Broadcast Fund Incentive Formula	68
(c) Provide the CBC with new financing ear-marked exclusively for independently-produced Canadian Programming	70
(d) Broaden the Broadcast Fund to encompass feature film production	71
(e) Region programming	72
(f) Administrative Matters	72
Footnotes	74
Bibliography	75
Appendices	
A. List of Persons Interviewed	
B. The Way Out of the Crisis	
C. List of Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund Projects	
D. Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund: Sources of Funds (Financial Analysis)	

THE CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

FUND: PAST EXPERIENCE AND FUTURE OPTIONS¹

1. INTRODUCTION

This review of the Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund was commissioned by the Federal Task Force on Broadcasting Policy on November 28, 1985. It was carried out in consultation with the staff of the Department of Communication and Telefilm Canada. In addition, meetings were held with representatives of the CBC, major private sector broadcasters, Societe Générale du Cinéma du Québec, distributors, as well as with a number of individual producers (for a list of those interviewed see Appendix A).

It should be understood that the success of any policy initiative depends on the context in which it is placed. As Marcel Masse, Minister of Communications, stated (March 15, 1985: 14) with respect to an earlier review of the Fund:

I want to stress the fact that the review of the broadcast fund has raised many issues that cannot be properly resolved either by changes to the criteria which govern access to the fund or changes in the way that Telefilm Canada administers the fund. Without a strong domestic market, a financially stable Canadian Television Production Industry will not develop. However, the resources that public and private

broadcasters in Canada make available for the purchase of Canadian television programs reflect many different influences—including the strength of the private broadcasting industry, the way the industry is structured, the regulatory policies of the CRIC, the existence or absence of effective tax incentives, as well as the mandate of the CBC and the way the CBC interprets that mandate.

The basic objectives of the study are:

- a. To examine the effectiveness of the Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund as a means of strengthening private sector production in Canada and allowing private sector producers to make a substantially increased contribution to producing programs that reflect the creative talent of Canadians and contribute to the reflection of Canada in dramatic, variety, arts and children's programming.
- b. To identify any weaknesses in the original conception and design of the Fund, or in its operation, that reduces its effectiveness as an instrument for achieving the above objectives.
- c. To assess either possible changes to the Fund or alternatives to the Fund which more effectively achieve its purposes.

2. THE ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

The role of the Canadian Broadcasting System under the Broadcasting Act of 1968 has been to provide "varied and comprehensive" programming that is

"of high standard using predominantly Canadian creative and other resources." The new national strategy towards television broadcasting of 1983 described in the policy paper Towards a New National Broadcasting Policy (March, 1983) was announced at a time when it was obvious that the Canadian Broadcasting System was failing to meet the mandate provided for it under the Broadcasting Act.

To understand why the Canadian broadcasting system was failing to provide the level or quality of Canadian programming envisaged by the Broadcasting Act we need to examine the economics of program production in Canada versus purchase from abroad.

The best source of data available for the revenues and costs associated with Canadian programming is provided by Lapointe and Le Goff (1980), however this data is for 1978 and hence is becoming rather dated. Their data, together with our calculations of profit margin, is provided for different program categories in Table 2.1.

In the French-language market, which is somewhat protected by the linguistic barrier, very low cost Canadian programming can pull in revenues close to the level of the three times larger English-language market. As a consequence, all types of Canadian programming enjoy a positive profit margin. Drama has a healthy profit margin of .99 while variety more than breaks even. Hence it is not surprising that the crisis that existed in English-language Canadian programming prior to the new national policy was not evident in French-language programming.

It can be seen that, in the English-language market, Canadian television broadcasters lose money by showing Canadian drama and variety, the more expensive types of programming to produce. Although Canadian produced drama and variety programs with low (by U.S. and British standards) production values can attract reasonable audiences, the dollar cost of even these modest productions means the programs involved have negative margins. The fundamental problem here is the small size of the Canadian

Table 2.1

AVERAGE COST AND REVENUE PER HALF HOUR OF CANADIAN
PROGRAMMING BY PROGRAM CATEGORY, 1978

	<u>Cost</u> ¹	<u>Revenue</u> ²	<u>Margin</u>	<u>Margin/ Costs</u>
<u>English-Language Market</u>				
Drama				
serials	\$114,750	\$59,536	\$(55,214)	(.48)
short films	137,160	78,166	(58,994)	(.43)
teledramas	112,830	46,318	(66,512)	(.59)
Variety	115,620	74,452	(41,168)	(.35)
Game shows	18,900	57,882	38,962	2.06
News	36,887	68,301	31,414	.85
Documentaries	20,768	26,098	5,330	.26
<u>French-Language Market</u>				
Drama				
soap operas	25,860	51,390	25,530	.99
Variety	38,925	44,448	5,523	.14
Game shows	21,090	42,620	21,530	1.02
News & Information	29,730	36,025	6,295	.21

Notes:

¹Costs are the average cost of a 30-minute program for a sample of programs in each category.

²The average revenue was obtained in the following manner: The minimum 30-second rate during prime time viewing for a network which had broadcast the program was multiplied by twenty time periods. This gave the revenue for a half-hour of programming for which the 15 per cent agency commission was subtracted. This income was divided by the average audience of the network during prime time, which gave the income per viewer. The average income by category of program was then obtained by multiplying the audience of each program by the revenue per viewer. The data are for rates and audiences in Fall, 1978.

Source: A. Lapointe and J. Le Goff, Television programs and their Production in Canada, Department of Communications, May 1980, Tables 1.25 and 1.26; columns 3 and 4 by the authors.

market which cannot provide sufficient advertising revenue to cover such costs. In addition, the modest cost of the Canadian productions is presumably explained by the broadcasters belief that more ambitious undertakings would add more to costs than to revenue. On the other hand, game shows, news and documentaries, with their lower costs, have positive margins. We suspect sports programming also enjoys a positive margin.

Lapointe and Le Goff do not provide similar data for the purchase of U.S. programming. However, undoubtedly the most profitable programming for Canadian English-language broadcasters is U.S. light drama. This is the most popular programming on Canadian T.V. and attracts substantial advertising revenue. In addition, such programming can be bought from the U.S. at very low cost. For example, "Dallas" is bought by a Canadian network for \$50,000 per hour episode for simultaneous release even though the production costs in the U.S. are about \$1 million per episode (CBC, 1983:12). U.S. producers with a rich home market of over 200 million available, can expect to recover costs from home sales. Export sales involve virtually zero incremental cost and can be viewed simply as a bonus by U.S. producers. The level of the U.S. export price is really determined by the degree of competition for the program among potential Canadian importers.

Lapoint and Le Goff (1980:107) report that the average American budget for drama in 1978 was about \$250,000, twice the Canadian budget. But such programming could be bought at that time by Canadian broadcasters for \$15,000 to \$20,000. The higher production value U.S. programs undoubtedly brought in more revenue than that indicated in Table 2.1 for Canadian

drama. Hence it seems safe to conclude that a margin/costs ratio in excess of 3.00 can be anticipated for U.S. drama. CBC Vice-president Denis Harvey recently stated the cost, in terms of loss of advertising revenue and increased programming costs of replacing a season of an hour long series such as "Dallas" by a Canadian show to be \$15 million (Fraser, September 18, 1985:11).

A profit-maximizing private broadcaster will wish to choose a program mix that concentrates on those programs with high margins. Hence, it is not surprising that at the time the new national policy was introduced, although drama accounted for 49% of the viewing time spent watching English-language Canadian broadcasters, Canadian drama was responsible for only 2% of total viewing time (see Towards a New National Broadcasting Policy, March 1983:8).

Lapointe and Le Goff focused on in-house productions and did not consider other sales of the programming in their estimates of revenues. However, other sales opportunities within Canada are extremely limited. Such possibilities include the sale of rights to pay T.V., sale of rights to a dubbed version to a broadcaster or network in another language or sale to a broadcaster in another region. An additional possibility is the editing of a film version of a mini-series for release to movie theaters (see Fraser, November 10, 1984, E1).

The main sales opportunities, however, are international. Potential foreign markets for Canadian English-language T.V. programs include the U.S., U.K. and Australia, although dubbing possibilities mean that export

opportunities are not limited to English-language countries. We have already mentioned the relatively low price of U.S. programs exported to Canada, so it is no great surprise to learn that the average price per episode paid in 1983 for programs imported into the U.S. was only \$9,000 to \$10,000 (assuming U.S. \$1.00 = Canadian \$1.33 and rounded to the nearest \$1000) while half hour episodes imported by the U.K. sold in the range of \$2,000 to \$19,000, and rights for a run in the four largest Australian cities sold for about \$7,000 (Variety, May 9, 1984:303). Consistent with these figures, Jan Rofekamp, President of Montreal distributor Film Transit, recently indicated that a Canadian documentary made for \$250,000 was sold to the U.K., France, and West Germany, for a meager \$15,000 apiece (Enchin, September 9, 1985:12). Similarly, Isme Bennie, President of the Toronto company that distributes Canadian television programs internationally, stated that a half hour television drama can only be expected to deliver foreign sales revenue of \$30,000 to \$40,000 an episode over three years (Ibid). However, pre-sales of a program are considerably more remunerative and can be expected to bring five to ten times more than an after sale. One way of putting foreign sales possibilities in perspective is to note that total international sales by the CBC this year are estimated at \$6 million and by the private sector, \$5 million (Ibid).

Another channel for distribution of high quality internationally competitive programs is the video cassette. For the really successful program, this can be very remunerative. For example, video cassette sales for "Hockey Night", an independent production shown on CBC last season, are reported to have reached \$300,000 (Shields, August 31, 1985:14).

A strategy that can spread costs and almost guarantee an export market is that of international co-production. It is interesting to note that the British Broadcasting Corporation, a larger player in the international league than any of the Canadian participants, is increasingly choosing this route and now depends on co-productions for about 40% of its music and arts output and over 50% of its drama series and serials output (Reynolds, July 11, 1985:16).

Given the economics of the situation described, it is not surprising that the price-cost margins of television stations are very sensitive to the amount of Canadian content offered (see McFadyen, Hoskins and Gillen, 1980: 153).

3. THE TECHNOLOGICAL AND REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

Canadian television programming faces competition from imported U.S. signals and from U.S. programming exhibited by Canadian broadcasters. Even when Canadian television broadcasting began in 1952 there was competition from U.S. border stations that could be received over-the-air by a significant portion of Canadian viewers. Except in the case of French-language services, no protection existed in the form of linguistic barriers. Then ten to fifteen years ago, Canada became one of the first countries to be cabled with cable companies making their profits by supplying U.S. channels previously unavailable. In recent years, U.S. stations, available over-the-air or by cable, have enjoyed a share of viewing time of about 31% (CBC 1984:14). Now satellite technology is presenting Canadian programming and the Canadian Broadcasting System with

another challenge. Canadians owning a ten-foot dish, costing about \$2000 can get access to a multitude of U.S. satellite channels.

In addition to direct competition from U.S. signals, Canadian programming faces competition from foreign programming exhibited by Canadian broadcasters. The extent of the foreign (mainly U.S.) programming shown by Canadian broadcasters in peak time is illustrated in Table 3.1. The reasons for the economic attractiveness of U.S. programming for Canadian broadcasters has already been examined.

The role of regulation has been to attempt to force or entice private broadcasters to offer Canadian programming they would not otherwise undertake. Prior to the new national strategy, the regulatory attitude to imported signals was protectionist. For example, for several years, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) fought an unsuccessful rearguard action to prevent cable importation of distant U.S. signals by microwave. Similarly, the CRTC delayed the introduction of Pay-TV for approximately ten years. Other protectionist measures include Bill C-58 and the CRTC's simultaneous substitution policy. However, even where protective measures have been successful in boosting broadcasters' profits, there is no evidence that these additional profits lead to incremental expenditures on Canadian programming. This is not surprising as such measures do not affect the economic incentives that favour exhibiting U.S. programming.

Table 3.1
 PRIME TIME HOURS/MINUTES, 7-11 P.M.
 (Week of January 15-21, 1983)

	CBC		CTV	TVA	Global
	English	French			
Canadian Entertainment & Sports	10:00	13:30	3:00	9:15	3:30
Canadian News & Information	10:00	6:00	2:30	9:45	3:00
Foreign Programs	8:00	8:30	22:30	9:00	21:30
TOTAL	28:00	28:00	28:00	28:00	28:00

Source: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, The Strategy of the CBC,
 Ottawa, 1983, p. 33

The primary vehicle for promoting Canadian programming exhibition by Canadian broadcasters has been the CRTC's Canadian content regulations. These have required private stations to show 60% Canadian programming on a full day basis and 50% on a prime time basis (6 PM to midnight) averaged over a year. Conduct regulation, which attempts to cause private firms to act against the interests of their shareholders, invites token responses, and private stations have thwarted the intention of the prime time quota by bunching Canadian programming into the early and late evening thus leaving the peak period for the profitable U.S. programming. For example, CTV, 1978 - 1979, exhibited only 6% Canadian programming in peak period (8 PM to 10:30 PM) (CRTC, 1979: Volume 1, Table 14). The data in Table 3.1, for CTV and Global, provide further evidence of the use of this strategy. Another ploy has been to concentrate Canadian programming in the summer off-season. A third has been to produce low cost Canadian programming to minimize the loss possible from such programming.

As we have seen, broadcasters' profits are very sensitive to the level of Canadian content. No form of regulation can persuade a broadcaster to remain operating unprofitably and hence "Promises of Performance", that require behaviour that leads the broadcaster foregoing profits, are difficult to enforce. As Michael Waring from Woods Gundy points out, to win a licence "you don't say, 'we're going to do this to make a lot of money', you say 'we are going to lose a lot of money, but we are doing it for the good of Canadian broadcasting.'" (The Financial Times, April 23, 1984:7). Both Global and CTVY initially fulfilled their programming promises but largely abandoned them when they ran into financial difficulties.

Hence we believe that the experience prior to the new national broadcasting strategy of 1983 demonstrates that conduct regulation alone failed to cajole or induce private broadcasters to exhibit the programming envisaged by the Broadcasting Act.

4. THE FUND IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NEW NATIONAL BROADCASTING STRATEGY OF 1983

The timing and contents of the new national policy, including the creation of the Canadian Broadcast Program Development (CBPD) Fund, were influenced by the report of the Federal Cultural Review Committee (Applebaum and Hébert, 1982). This report said that the cultural objectives laid out in the 1968 Broadcasting Act have not been achieved. It concluded that Canadian content rules have not worked and that private broadcasters have failed in their responsibility to provide informational programming and quality entertainment. With respect to CBC, the report concluded that CBC programming too closely resembles that of the private broadcasters. The CBC was also criticized for relying too much on its in-house productions.

The policy paper, Towards a New National Broadcasting Policy (March 1983) gives the goals of the new strategy as:

1. To maintain the Canadian Broadcasting System as an effective vehicle of social and cultural policy in light of a renewed commitment to the spirit of the broadcasting objectives set out in the 1968 Act.
2. To make available to all Canadians a solid core of attractive Canadian programming in all program categories, through the development of strong Canadian broadcast and program production industries.
3. To provide a significantly increased choice of programming of all kinds in both official languages in all parts of Canada.

The Fund was created then as part of the new national broadcasting strategy that recognized that Canadians are entitled to as much choice in programming as technical, contractual and international arrangements enable them to receive, but believes the choice to be meaningless unless it includes programming that reinforces the cultural heritage of Canadians. For the first time, new technologies were looked upon as providing an opportunity rather than a threat. It recognized that Canadians are entitled to the choice of programming available through ownership of a satellite dish and encourages the growth of a new range of Canadian and foreign services to be distributed by cable. The emphasis was on distribution by cable, presumably because cable can more easily be controlled than satellite signals, and permitted MATV only when the CRTC is satisfied there would be no serious economic impact on the local cable operator. Despite some exceptions like this, however, the previous protectionist attitude was largely abandoned.

The increased choice, however, was regarded as meaningless unless it included programming that reinforced the cultural heritage of Canadians. The major thrust of the new broadcasting strategy was thus to develop a strong broadcast and program production industry to develop high quality, internationally competitive programs. The CBPD Fund to be administered by Telefilm Canada (called the Canadian Film Development Corporation at the time the Fund was established) was chosen as the vehicle for this purpose.

The new broadcasting strategy recognized for the first time that:

In the new broadcasting environment, regulation is not sufficient to preserve an identifiable Canadian Broadcasting System. In particular, it is vital, and now a matter of

policy, that the private Canadian program industry have additional funds at its disposal in order to compete with the flood of foreign programming now available because of the new technologies. It is for this reason that the Federal Government has decided to establish the Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund.

The new strategy is aimed at "strengthening the private broadcasting sector so that it can compete with an influx of foreign programming." The hope is that there will be an increase in quantity and quality of Canadian programming shown by private broadcasters. The CBC is given the role of complementing the private sector by providing a distinctive Canadian service. The Fund is intended to result in internationally competitive programming and to establish a framework for international marketing of Canadian television programs.

The introduction of the Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund occurred at the same time as a 6% tax on cable television industry revenue was introduced. Although the revenue from the cable industry tax was not earmarked for the Fund, it did serve to offset the costs of the new Fund.

5. THE ORIGINAL GUIDELINES FOR THE FUND

As described in Towards a New National Broadcasting Policy (March 1983) and the Memorandum of Understanding (February 21, 1983), the Fund was made available for assistance in the production of drama, children's, and variety programming; categories where there had been a particular dearth of Canadian product. Telefilm Canada was given discretion over whether its investment in a particular program production was in the form of a loan, a loan guarantee, equity, or some mix of these. The size of the

Fund planned was \$34 million in 1983-84, \$50 million in 1984-85, \$54 million in 1985-86, \$56 million in 1986-87, and \$60 million in 1987-88. As a minimum, the producer was required to raise \$2 for every \$1 from the fund. With the leverage effect this entails, the expectation was that at least \$105 million extra would be infused into Canadian production in 1984.

The CBPD Fund was to be available only to private Canadian production companies and independent producers. In addition, producers were required to obtain agreement from an over-the-air Canadian broadcaster to exhibit the program within two years of its completion. At least half of the Fund was allocated to television programs exhibited by private broadcasters with up to a half to television programs to be exhibited by CBC. About one-third of the fund was to be invested in French-language television productions and two-thirds in English-language television productions. In addition, there were instructions to "take appropriate measures to identify provincial and regional interests in the development of Canada's program production industry, and seek an appropriate balance in its investments so as to foster program productions in all regions of Canada."

For programming in the eligible categories, the Fund could be used for planning, developing and producing programs. The programming was to be suitable for exhibition by a broadcaster between the hours of 7 PM and 11 PM, was to be of high quality, and directed toward new productions and not established program commitments.

The Memorandum of Understanding states "that creative control should rest with Canadians, and that employment opportunities, to the maximum extent possible, should be provided for Canadians in all stages of Canadian television production." To elaborate on this, Annex A, sub-section 10(2) of the CFDC Act is included which states:

"Canadian feature film" or "Canadian feature film production" is a feature film or feature film production in respect of which the Corporation has determined:

- A. that the completed film will, in the judgement of the corporation, have a significant Canadian creative, artistic and technical content, and that arrangements have been made to make sure that the copyright in the completed film will be beneficially owned by an individual resident in Canada, by corporation incorporated under the law of Canada or a province or by any combination of such persons; or
- B. the provision has been made for the production of the film under co-production agreement entered into between Canada and another country.

The inference is that these guidelines for Canadian content qualification are to apply also for television production.

It is not made clear, either in Towards a New National Broadcasting Policy or the Memorandum of Understanding, whether the primary mandate of the Fund is cultural or industrial. The Memorandum mentions employment opportunities while the section in the policy paper specifically on the Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund also stresses the economic benefits, namely the creation of "a large number of additional jobs in the private program production centres" and the exploitation of the "growing export market for quality programming". However, in other sections of the policy paper the need for programming "which reinforces the cultural

heritage of all Canadians" is mentioned and there is talk of new cultural policies "based in part on the overriding importance of ensuring that Canadian culture thrives in the new technological environment."

Another area of ambiguity is whether the Fund is primarily aimed at supporting independent producers or private broadcasters. The policy paper laments that "Canadian program producers lack the resources their competitors can command." The reason given for the establishment of the Fund is in order that "the private Canadian program production industry have additional funds at its disposal in order to compete with the flood of foreign programming now available because of the new technologies." However, a goal is also "the development of a strong Canadian broadcast" industry.

6. THE EXPERIENCE OF THE FUND DURING THE FIRST 21 MONTHS

Sub-sections (a) to (e) are primarily based on data provided by Telefilm Canada to the authors. The data is for contracted projects defined to include projects where a signed deal letter had been sent although the contract had not yet been formally signed. Telefilm tell us that the deal letter constitutes a legal commitment and hence it makes sense to include such projects with those contracted. Projects where only a deal letter had been signed numbered 11 whereas projects with a signed contract numbered 124. It may be noted that because of the inclusion of these eleven projects, and also because of inclusion of amendments to projects whose budgets were revised, the total budget of \$193 million for the 21

month period is greater than the \$169 million reported for contracted projects in After Two Years (Telefilm Canada, 1985:69).

(a) Production Volume

From Table 6.1 we see that the Fund got off to a very slow start. Telefilm Canada investment in the first nine months of \$10.3 million is obviously not in line with the budget planned for 1983-84 of \$34 million. For the financial year 1984-85, the investment of \$45 million is much closer to that planned of \$50 million. In the first nine months the bulk of the programming budget, 78% of English-language projects and 88% of French-language projects, was drama. In the subsequent twelve months the Fund was appreciably more successful in inducing English-language children's programming, which increased from 2% to 25%, and French-language variety programming, up from 3% to 23%. As a consequence, the budget share of drama fell to 65% for English-language projects and 70% for French-language.

Part of the explanation for the slow start in the first nine months may be the normal lead time associated with a new incentive. However, we believe changes in the operation of the Fund were also responsible. It will be noted that in the last 12 months of the 21-month period the Telefilm Canada average rate of participation was 32%, so most projects were financed at the maximum rate possible, whereas for the first 9 months the rate was only 21%. The other change was an increasing willingness by Telefilm Canada to permit its own equity investment to be partially

Table 6.1
PROJECTS CONTRACTED BY TELEFILM CANADA
July 1, 1983 to March 31, 1985

		July 1, 1983 to March 31, 1984		April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1985	
Number of		Total		Number of	
Projects	Budgets	Canada	Projects	Total	Telefilm
French					
Drama	10	24,741,202	4,218,082	18	22,780,738
Variety	3	2,550,525	811,727	9	7,529,084
Children's	3	768,165	255,295	5	2,154,380
Sub-Total	16	28,059,892	5,285,104	32	32,464,202
English					
Drama	14	19,174,912	4,673,606	28	70,548,748
Variety	4	4,963,311	1,070,333	19	10,827,316
Children's	2	532,359	172,501	20	26,734,631
Sub-Total	20	24,670,582	5,916,440	67	108,110,696
TOTAL	36	52,730,474	11,201,544	99	140,574,898

1. Includes projects for which a deal letter sent but a contract not yet signed.
2. Telefilm amended this figure to \$10,341,544 by transferring \$860,000 to the next financial year.
3. Telefilm amended this figure to \$45,335,720 by transferring \$860,000 from the previous financial year.

Source: Tables provided to the authors by Telefilm Canada.

subordinate to other Canadian equity through tiered recoupment arrangements, made on a case-by-case basis, with private Canadian investors given preferential treatment in the early tiers. It is difficult to pinpoint a date when this change was made but Michael Helm, Director of the Broadcasting Policy Division of the Department of Communications, tells us he first became aware of such an operating policy in the Fall of 1984.

In the original Memorandum of Understanding no provision for a budget for script development was included. Telefilm Canada officials, Ian McLaren and Judith McCann, regard this as an obvious omission and we agree. The slow take-up of the Fund is no doubt partially explained by the initial dearth of suitable scripts and then lack of budget to stimulate their immediate provision. The importance of a generous supply of scripts is indicated by the practice of our major competitor:

Prior to each television season in the United States, about 500 ideas for new, mass-market dramatic series are roughed out. About 250 of these get as far as detailed plot outlines, and 100 go to scripting. About 50 reach the pilot-film stage. Perhaps six actually go on the air, and perhaps three succeed in staying there for a full season or more. (McQueen, 1983:130)

There is an interesting contrast between the first nine months and the subsequent twelve months in terms of the share of Telefilm investments made in French-language projects. In dollar terms, during the first nine months 47% of Telefilm investment was in French-language projects. This is obviously way in excess of the one-third guideline. However, in the subsequent twelve months this situation reversed with the French-language share of Telefilm investment down to 22%. We will return to this later.

(b) Allocation of Funding between Private and Public Broadcasters

During the first nine months, the private broadcaster participation in English-language Telefilm projects was 69% (a \$1.6 million share of \$2.4 million) but for French-language projects was only 28% (a \$0.8 million share of \$2.9 million) (see 'Sources of Funds' table in Appendix D). In fact even the 28% is probably misleading as 21 percentage points of this is accounted for by CTV. Judith McCann tells us this comprised a co-production with France, and on this basis was originally classified as French-language, but was actually shot in English. With another 6% emanating from Radio Quebec, the share of independents (includes Tele-Metropole and the TVA network), was less than 1%. In contrast, for English-language projects, CTV accounted for 11%, independents 30%, and Global 29%, with the remaining 31% being contributed by CBC/SRC.

In the subsequent 12 months, the financial year ending March 31, 1985, the private broadcaster share of broadcast participation in English-language projects plummeted to 30% (from 69%). Global was down to 6% and independents to 13%. However, the big story here is the virtually complete withdrawal of the CTV network which contributed less than one percentage point (in addition, during this period no projects with CTV involvement were classified as French-language), although CTV affiliates contributed 8%. The private broadcaster share of French-language projects rose to 42% but nearly all of this, 39 percentage points, was contributed by Radio Quebec (included by Telefilm in their tables as a private broadcaster) with only 2% emanating from independents. The CBC/SRC

contribution was thus 70% of English-language projects and 58% of French-language projects.

Obviously such figures are inconsistent with the objective that at least half of the Fund's contribution be allocated to television productions to be shown by private broadcasters. The figures certainly support the statement by Pierre Juneau, President of the CBC, that "without our commitment, the entire strategy supporting the utilization of the Fund would have collapsed" (May 15, 1984). When the CBC announced, December 1984, that it was withdrawing from future Fund projects (as a response to a decision to cut the CBC's operating budget for the next fiscal year by \$75 million) the future of the Fund was indeed in doubt.

However, we feel the reasons for the virtually complete absence of private broadcaster (excluding Radio Quebec) involvement in the French-language projects in the first 21 months and the relative lack of involvement by English-language private broadcasters in the financial year ending March 31, 1985, are very different.

(c) Private Broadcaster participation in French-language projects

We believe the lack of participation by the French-language private broadcasters, notably Tele-Metropole and the TVA network, is due primarily to the profitability of télé romans (French-language soap operas). Lapointe and Le Goff's data suggests a profit margin of .99. With proven profitable in-house projects it is understandable that the private

broadcaster does not wish to share the profits with independent producers or Telefilm Canada. In our view, this lack of involvement should not be regarded as a failure if the objective is competitive Canadian programming, it is only a failure if it is perceived that the primary purpose of the Fund is to support independent producers.

We also asked Michel Houle, formerly General Manager of Societe Générale du Cinéma du Québec, to identify the characteristics of the French-language market that have led to the limited participation by both private broadcasters and Telefilm Canada in this sector. He feels the problems are basically economic. Both domestic and international sales opportunities are limited. Despite the fact that Radio-Canada has a French audience as large as the English-speaking audience of the CBC English network it has a smaller budget and accordingly pays less for broadcast licences for French-language programming. French-language sales on the international market are very difficult to come by because of the reluctance of France to purchase Quebec programs. Even when they do buy such programs they often dub them.

Another problem in the French-language sector is the difficult union relationships that exist at the principal French-language private broadcaster Tele-Metropole. The strike history at Tele-Metropole leads to concerns that labour difficulties may arise if production is let out to private producers. In addition, the previous tough negotiating positions adopted by Tele-Metropole management have led to a low level of in-house production cost as a result of lower than average labour rates.

Another factor that is important in the French-language sector is the tradition in Quebec of creative people in the film production industry being accustomed to creative freedom in the production of feature films. This has led to a greater relative interest in using the Fund for the purpose of feature film production than for the purpose of television program production. Houle considers:

1. French-language producers would like a higher (than in the English-language sector) percentage participation by Telefilm Canada in their productions because of the greater financial risk they face as a result of their limited market opportunities.
2. French-language producers would prefer decisions at Telefilm to be made on the track-record of the producer not on a project-by-project basis as at present. They would like to see a continuing commitment to successful producers.

It should be noted that point (1) above is not consistent with the Lapointe and Le Goff data.

(d) Private broadcaster participation in English-language projects

The slowness of private English-language broadcasters to participate is more likely a reflection of the dubious economics of such involvement. For example, Denis Harvey, CBC-TV's Vice President, is reported as saying that the adventure serial "Danger Bay", despite being made with money from the Fund and the Disney Channel, still costs CBC \$100,000 an episode, whereas a comparable half-hour episode of a U.S. serial could have been bought for \$20,000 to \$30,000 (Worron, October 7, 1984). For a private broadcaster, already constrained by the Canadian content quota, the trade-off may not be between yet another U.S. drama serial or Canadian

drama but rather Canadian drama, with Telefilm Canada involvement, or more Canadian news or sports. These latter categories are generally profitable and much less risky than Canadian drama.

It is worth noting, however, that the rate of participation by different private English-language broadcasters is very uneven. Given its size, it was primarily the reluctance of the CTV network to get involved during the year ending March 31, 1985, that was responsible for the slow private broadcast adoption of the Fund.

(e) Financial Sources and their Relative Importance

i) July 1, 1983, to March 31, 1984.

From 'Sources of Funds' data for this period (reproduced in Appendix D of this Report) we see that the Canadian broadcaster share of the total budget for contracted projects was 10% for both French-language (a \$2.9 million share of \$28 million) and English-language projects (a \$2.4 million share of \$25 million). This is nowhere near the one-third contribution that seems to have been originally envisaged.

On the other hand, foreign funding was 37% of French-language projects and 30% of English-language projects. With contributions of this magnitude, foreign interests may expect a significant say in the programs being produced. The contributions are much higher than that of Canadian producers at 7% for French-language projects and 20% for English-language projects.

Hidden within the private sector investment is what can be regarded as private venture capital. This comprises 1% for French-language productions and 4% for English-language projects. Even with very attractive OCA rates of 50% in year 1 and 50% in year 2, in Quebec the year 1 figure is 150%, and usually preferential treatment in recoupment, private venture capital obviously was not clamouring to invest in Canadian drama, variety or children's programming.

ii) April 1, 1984, to March 31, 1985.

As we see from Table 6.2 the contribution of Canadian broadcasters increased to 16%, but was still less than half that originally envisaged. The private sector contribution, almost all in the form of a license fee, is only 5% but it should be noted that the main users in this sector are the independent stations which only have a local market to exploit. As we have noted, the CTV network, with a national market to recoup the advertising revenue associated with licensing a program, was an insignificant user of the Fund during this period. The CBC/SRC contribute more than 21% but over one-fifth of this is in the less helpful form of equity. In addition, it is reported, the CBC/SRC often insist on limiting or even eliminating Pay-TV exhibition or, for a feature film, theatrical release (see Telefilm Canada, November 1985 : 17).

Sources of Funds data for this period (reproduced in Appendix D of this Report) indicates the share of foreign funding for French-language projects went down substantially to 23% (a \$7.5 million share of \$32.5 million) while the share for English-language projects remained almost unchanged at 28% (a \$30.6 million share of \$108.1 million).

Table 6.2
CANADIAN BROADCASTING SHARE OF CONTRACTED PROJECTS¹
April 1, 1984 - March 31, 1985

	<u>CBC/SRC</u>	<u>Private Network</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of Productions	65	34	99
Total Budgets	\$90,868,957	\$50,751,223	\$141,620,180
Licence Fees	\$15,420,738	\$ 2,558,600	\$ 17,979,338
Equity	\$ 4,033,514	\$ 80,800	\$ 4,114,314
Broadcaster Share	21.4%	5.2%	15.6%

¹ Source Telefilm Canada, Financing Canadian Television Production, a paper submitted to the Caplan - Sauvagneau Committee, November 1985, p. 17

The contribution share of Canadian producers for French-language projects increased to 11% (from 7%) but for English-language projects was substantially down at 7% (from 20%).

Private venture capital invested in French-language projects remains at the insignificant proportion of 2% (from 1%) but for English-language projects increased to 8% (from 4%).

(f) Financial Experience

The Statement of Operations included in the published annual report for Telefilm Canada for the years ended March 31, 1984 and March 31, 1985 appear as Tables 6.3 and 6.4. In each case the supplementary analysis of assistance expenses by type of instrument is included. Examination of the analysis of assistance expenses demonstrates the dramatic shift away from Telefilm funding of feature films over the two-year period. For the year ended March 31, 1984, feature films accounted for one-third of all investments but by 1985 this figure had fallen to one-sixth. Although return on investment was negligible in the first period, by 1985 returns had risen to over \$2 million, more than half of which was accounted for by the much smaller dollar volume of feature films. Since the proceeds from investments figure is not broken down according to the year in which the investment was made, it was necessary to examine recoupement over the two-year period in order to assess the financial returns on programming investments. In the case of feature films, investments of \$10.9 million have produced proceeds of \$1.31 million, a return equal to 12% of the

original investment. (Note, this is not the same as a 12% return on the original investment.) Programs other than feature films returned \$917,000 of the \$43.2 million invested or 2% of the original investment. The steady decline in the amount of loans written off (from \$1.9 million in 1983 to \$320,000 in 1984 and then to \$70,000 in 1985) reveals the steady trend away from the use of loan finance as a means of achieving the objectives of the Fund.

Turning to the Statement of Operations itself, one can observe the growing momentum of assistance provided to the production industry with total assistance expense rising from \$2.3 million in 1984 to \$45.2 million in 1985. French-language production grew by only 150% with all other categories of assistance being four times as large in 1985 as compared to 1984. In the French-language sector, the division of assistance between feature films and other Canadian programming is quite revealing. In 1985, \$2.1 million of the total \$13.0 million French-language assistance (one-sixth of the total) was devoted to feature films whereas out of the much larger English-language total of \$27.4 million only \$1.8 million (6 1/2%) was devoted to feature films. The limited take-up of Fund assistance in the French-language private production sector is clearly related to difficulties in the non-feature film area. The significant revenue raised from management fees (\$1.2 million in 1985 as compared to a total administrative expense of \$1.8 million) demonstrates the basis for the Telefilm interest in restoring a management fee on their projects.

Table 6.3
TELEFILM CANADA
STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 1984

	1984		1983	
	Canadian Programming	Feature Films	Total	Total
Assistance Expenses (see Note)				
English production	4,337,854	1,972,185	6,310,039	2,468,689
French production	3,539,772	1,662,899	5,202,671	1,249,049
Marketing and distribution	-	478,480	478,480	344,833
Development of the industry	-	322,108	322,108	257,162
	7,877,626	4,435,672	12,313,298	4,319,733
Revenues				
Interest on loans to producers	60,992	222,087	283,079	261,291
Management fees	207,106	94,538	301,644	71,247
	268,098	316,625	584,723	332,538
Cost of operations before administrative expenses	7,609,528	4,119,047	11,728,575	3,987,195
Administrative expenses			910,857	619,723
Cost of operations for the year			\$12,639,432	\$4,606,918

Note:

Assistance expenses	1984		1983	
	Canadian Programming	Feature Films	Total	Total
Investments	\$7,220,339	\$3,631,635	\$10,851,974	\$2,042,490
Proceeds from investments	(6,725)	(211,906)	(218,631)	(178,399)
Loans written-off	-	319,712	319,712	1,894,273
Reimbursements of loans previously written off	-	(338,848)	(338,848)	(382,730)
	7,213,614	3,400,593	10,614,207	3,375,634
Operating expenses	664,012	1,035,079	1,699,091	944,099
	\$7,877,626	\$4,435,672	\$12,313,298	\$4,319,733

Table 6.4
TELEFILM CANADA
STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 1985

	1985			1984
	Canadian Programming	Feature Films	Total	Total
Assistance expenses (See Note)				
English production	\$25,539,836	\$1,854,462	\$27,394,298	\$ 6,310,039
French production	10,927,351	2,122,054	13,049,405	5,202,671
Marketing and distribution	-	2,999,291	2,999,291	478,480
Development of the industry	-	1,771,825	1,771,825	322,108
	36,467,187	8,747,632	45,214,819	12,313,298
Revenues				
Interest on loans to producers	271,412	398,886	670,298	283,079
Management fees	1,067,587	181,101	1,248,688	301,644
	1,338,999	579,987	1,918,986	584,723
Cost of operations before administration expenses	\$35,128,188	\$8,157,645	43,295,833	11,728,575
Administration expenses			1,759,093	910,857
Cost of operations for the year			\$45,054,926	\$12,639,432

Note:
Assistance expenses

	1985			1984
	Canadian Programming	Feature Films	Total	Total
Investments	\$36,083,096	\$7,276,018	\$43,359,114	\$10,851,974
Proceeds from investments	(910,383)	(1,104,211)	(2,014,594)	(218,631)
Loans written-off	-	70,636	70,636	319,712
Reimbursements of loans previously written-off	-	(478,776)	(478,776)	(338,848)
	35,172,713	5,763,667	40,936,380	10,614,207
Operating expenses	1,294,474	2,983,965	4,278,439	1,699,091
	36,467,187	8,747,632	45,214,819	12,313,298

7. THE CHANGES IN GUIDELINES FOR FUND EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1985

These changes were laid out in the Memorandum of Understanding, (March 15, 1985). Fund eligibility was widened to include documentaries and the regulations were clarified to confirm their applicability to the performing arts. In addition, a letter of intent, to air the program within two years of its completion, from a provincial educational broadcaster qualified programs in the eligible categories.

Some productions now qualify for an increased maximum Telefilm investment of 49%. To qualify for this increased limit, rather than the standard one-third, the program must earn the maximum ten points out of the ten on the CRTC ten point scale determining Canadian content unless it is a pilot for a series in which case 6 points out of the 10 is sufficient. It should be noted that this point system is based purely on the character of the inputs with two points being allocated for the director being Canadian, one point for the scriptwriter being Canadian, one point for the leading performer being Canadian, and so on. It is hence independent of the character of the output, for instance whether the program produced has cultural significance or is distinctive. We return to this point later in the Report.

On a temporary basis (April 1, 1985 to March 31, 1986), Telefilm Canada funding on projects that qualify for up to one-third funding can be provided above this normal limit up to the maximum 49% participation. The amount above the normal limit is on a matching basis equal to the fixed

sum licence fees agreed to by conventional Canadian broadcasters plus Canadian pay and specialty channels.

Up to 10% of the Fund is to be made available for script and project development, where there is a demonstrated interest by a broadcaster, on the basis of a maximum of 60% of cost on an individual project.

The new guidelines also endorse Telefilm Canada's emphasis on the use of Canadian-owned and controlled distribution companies. A \$300,000 domestic test marketing program for Canadian feature films was set up with an additional \$1.7 million allocated to match private sector spending on promotion and advertising. By the fiscal year-end, both programs had been expanded to cover all forms of production in all Canadian markets. The Film Festivals Bureau was transferred to Telefilm Canada which also accepted responsibility for the grants programs supporting Canadian film and video festivals from coast-to-coast. "The four foreign offices of the National Film Board of Canada were transferred to Telefilm Canada to help the private sector to penetrate international markets more effectively" (Telefilm Canada, Annual Report 1984-85: 4).

To encourage regional production, Telefilm introduced an "allowance for higher transportation and communications expenses incurred by producers and distributors located outside of the Toronto-Montreal access."

(Ibid: 5)

8. THE EXPERIENCE WITH THE FUND FROM APRIL 1, 1985

(a) Production Volume and Program Category

From information provided by Telefilm Canada for the seven-month period April 1, 1985 to October 31, 1985, which is presented in Table 8.1, we see that contracted projects had budgets totalling \$132.1 million or 78% of that for the first 21 months. During the seven months, the Telefilm Canada investment of \$52.1 million is more than it was during the first 21 months. Obviously after April 1, 1985, use of the Fund took off. Also, unlike the first 21 months, the proportion (33%) of Telefilm Canada investments made in French-language projects was in line with the one-third guideline.

From data presented in Table 8.1, the proportion of Telefilm Canada investment in different program categories can be calculated. For French-language productions, 59% is invested in drama, 12% in variety, 17% in children's programming, and 11% in documentaries. The percentage of drama is down slightly and variety substantially. For English-language productions, 67% of Telefilm Canada investment is in drama, 12% in variety, 17% in children's and 3% in documentary. Of interest here is the very low level of documentary programming induced after its addition to the list of eligible program categories. An explanation for this is provided in Section 10.

As we have seen, the revised Memorandum of Understanding (March 15, 1985) permits up to 10% of the Fund to be made available for script and project

Table 8.1
PROJECTS CONTRACTED BY TELEFILM CANADA
April 1, 1985 to October 31, 1985¹

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Number of Projects</u>	<u>Total Budgets</u>	<u>Telefilm Canada</u>	<u>% Telefilm Canada Investment</u>
<u>French</u>				
Drama	17	27,876,118	9,946,072	36
Variety	14	5,853,518	2,721,882	46
Children's	6	8,261,085	2,435,348	29
Documentary	14	5,319,893	2,148,289	40
Sub-Total	51	47,310,614	17,251,591	36
Development	6	244,664	100,025	41
Sub-Total	57	47,555,278	17,351,616	36
<u>English</u>				
Drama	23	55,697,073	21,960,964	39
Variety	13	10,151,205	4,584,335	45
Children's	8	13,853,265	6,579,418	47
Documentary	4	2,862,828	1,022,611	36
Sub-Total	48	82,564,371	34,746,932	42
Development	32	2,022,849	599,604	30
Sub-Total	80	84,587,220	34,746,932	41
<u>Total</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>132,142,498</u>	<u>52,098,548</u>	<u>39</u>

¹ Source is tables provided to authors by Telefilm Canada.

development on the basis of a maximum of 60% of the cost of an individual project. In fact, April 1 to October 31, 1985, for French-language contracted projects less than 1% of the Telefilm Canada budget was spent on development, and for English-language projects only 2%. For the six French-language projects that received Telefilm Canada development funding the average rate of Telefilm Canada participation was 41%, whereas for the 32 English-language projects it was 30%. Hence Telefilm Canada support has been well below the maximum permitted.

(b) Financial Sources and Their Relative Importance

From Table 8.1 we see that the participation rate for Telefilm Canada is 36% for French-language projects and 41% for English-language projects. For English-language and French-language variety, and English-language children's programming the level of investment is close to the maximum permitted. Telefilm Canada officials tell us that in fact the vast majority of projects they see qualify for up to 49% under the ten out of ten Canadian content rule (or six out of ten for a pilot project) and hence the temporary one-third plus matching the licence fee (up to a limit of 49%) provision has been largely a dead letter. The difference in participation rate between projects in the two languages is interesting.

The remainder of this sub-section is based on Sources of Funds data for contracted projects, again defined as including projects with a signed deal letter, for the period April 1 to October 31, 1985. (This data was supplied by Telefilm Canada and is reproduced in Appendix D of this

Report.) Using this data to calculate the share of the French-language broadcast budget of \$4.6 million accounted for by various types of broadcasters we find investment by private sector independents (including Tele-Metropole) remains very low at 7%, but Radio Quebec now contributes 20%, with 73% emanating from the CBC/SRC. The Fund obviously is still failing to get private French-language station support but Telefilm Canada officials believe ownership changes at Tele-Metropole and the licencing of a new station in Montreal will rectify this situation.

For English-language projects, however, there has been an up-surge in private broadcaster involvement with the big difference being that the CTV Network now contributes 17% (up from less than 1% during the previous 12 months), with CTV affiliates adding another 7%, of the English-language broadcaster budget of \$14.9 million. Global's share has also increased substantially to 15% (up from 6% in the previous 12 months). Independents are down to 7% (from 13%). With T.V. Ontario contributing 4%, the CBC/SRC share is now down to 50% (from 58%). The changes in Fund guidelines and operations hence seem to have induced the CTV network to become a significant player again and have also resulted in a healthy increase in Global participation. Although the CBC share is down, its monthly dollar participation rate is higher than during the previous 12 months. When we recall it was only December 1984 that CBC was announcing its withdrawal from all future Fund projects, this again suggests the amendments to the guidelines have been successful.

The Canadian broadcaster share of the total French-language budget of \$47.6 million is 10% (down from 22% in the previous 12 months) and of the English-language budget of \$129.8 million is 18% (up from 17%). Telefilm Canada officials complained that CBC/SRC in particular have used the increased participation rate of Telefilm Canada as an opportunity to reduce their own licence fees and the French-language figures are fully consistent with this. However, it is our interpretation of events that this was always expected and that part of the *raison d'être* for the increase in the maximum rate to 49% was to keep CBC/SRC participating despite the budget cut. It may be that the low Telefilm Canada participation rate, noted earlier, for French-language projects, where CBC/SRC is by far the dominant broadcaster, is due to Telefilm Canada reluctance to go along with reduced licence fees.

For other Canadian sources, the share of producers for French-language projects remains unchanged at 11% whereas for English-language projects it increased very slightly to 8% (from 7%). Private venture capital for English-language projects increased slightly to 9% (from 8%) while for French-language projects it increased to 4% (from 2%). Although these levels are low, the steady growth in the share of an expanding budget coming from this source is encouraging.

The share of foreign funding is 23% (unchanged from the previous 12 months) for French-language productions and 18% (down from 28%) for English-language. The latter is a substantial decrease. This may be of concern in terms of the economic viability of projects where foreign

pre-sale is sometimes suggested as the key to recoupment of total costs. A possible interpretation is that the increase in the rate of Telefilm Canada funding has displaced some foreign funding. From the viewpoint of Canadian control of program content, however, this could be viewed favourably.

(c) Funding of Continuing Series

Variety, November 27, 1985 outlines the financial consequences of a heavy commitment to continuing series: "(Andre Picard stated) 'When you're getting the launching of at least six series at budgets varying from \$150,000 to \$300,000 (per episode) and you fund a large proportion of that, and series are no longer for five to ten episodes but 20 to 25 episodes, the money goes very quickly.'"

An internal Broadcast Fund report prepared by Bob Linnell (Deputy Director of the Broadcast Fund) shows that "if all current 49% backed English-tracked series are renewed next season, they would take up the Fund's entire \$40 million allotment. The rest of next year's \$62 million grant must go for French-track production" (page 92).

By way of contrast, it should be noted that Telefilm Canada's discussion paper on Telefilm Canada's business plan for 1986-87 estimates that the Broadcast Fund will have invested \$34 million in continuing series by the end of 1985-86. It states that "if all these series were renewed, they would monopolize virtually half of the available funds next year. This

would leave little for new projects and for other categories of production." (page 3)

(d) Audience Ratings of Fund Projects

One essential dimension of performance that is not evaluated here is the audience acceptability of productions funded under the program. Unfortunately, sufficient time and resources were simply not available to permit any meaningful audience analysis of Fund-supported programming. We can cite the comment of Mr. Pearson (obviously an interested party) in Variety, November 27, 1985: "'One of the successes about the Broadcast Fund,' said Pearson, its Director for the first two years, 'is it's being broadcaster driven and the success of the broadcasters choosing the projects. Almost every series we have been involved in has had good to growing to great ratings from little ones like 'The Kids of Degrassi Street' to big operations like 'Night Heat'.'" (page 44)

9. REGIONAL BALANCE

Under the original Memorandum of Understanding, Telefilm Canada was requested to "take appropriate measures to identify provincial and regional interests in Canada's program production industry, and seek an appropriate balance in its investments so as to foster program production in all regions of Canada."

As we see, from Table 9.1, which shows the geographical allocation of project budgets over the entire period of the Fund, there has in fact been a heavy concentration of Telefilm investment in Ontario and Quebec with only 7% being allocated to other regions. In terms of the proportion of the regional project budget contributed by Telefilm Canada, the Western Provinces and Maritimes at 40% and 45% respectively have, however, fared well compared to the Canada-wide average of 33%. Perhaps surprisingly, B.C. projects have only received a 27% contribution. An explanation may be that continuing series ("Danger Bay") figure prominently and Telefilm have been concerned with reducing their rate of investment in a series once it has become established.

The CBC has attempted to analyze the regional distribution of their CBC/Telefilm expenditures and to provide some perspective for the regional analysis through comparison to the regional generation of revenue from the 6% tax on cable television revenues (see Table 9.2). This analysis reveals that 69% of the total regional expenditures of \$127 million was accounted for by Ontario with nearly all of that amount being expended in metropolitan Toronto. The corresponding figures for the 6% cable television revenue tax were \$26.2 million for all of Ontario and \$9.9 million in metro-Toronto, 41% and 16% of total tax revenues respectively.

It is difficult to provide a meaningful, regional perspective on Telefilm funding support without interviewing regional broadcasters and producers. Since sufficient time and financial resources were not available to undertake research in all regions, we have attempted, in what follows, to

Table 9.1

REGIONAL BREAKDOWN OF TELEFILM CANADA PROJECTS
July 1, 1983 - October 31, 1985

Region	Total Budget	% of Total	Telefilm	% of Total	Telefilm as % of Regional Budget
Ontario	138,466 ¹	43	49,788	47	36
Quebec	159,608	50	48,218	46	30
B.C.	12,841	4	3,483	3	27
Western Provinces	8,717	3	3,476	3	40
Maritimes	1,810	1	807	1	45
TOTAL	321,442	101 ²	105,772	100	33

¹All monetary amounts are in thousands of dollars.

²Due to rounding this does not add to 100.

Source: Data supplied to the authors by Telefilm Canada

Table 9.2
 CBC/TELEFILM ENGLISH-LANGUAGE PROJECTS
 REGIONAL BUDGET EXPENDITURE¹
 VS.
 REGIONAL CABLE-TELEFILM REVENUE
 JULY 1983-1985 (2 YRS.)

	Hrs.	CBC Commit.	Total Budget	Total Reg'l. Expend.	%	Total 6% Revenue	% Cable
Canada	206.0	25,578	149,078	127,096	100	64,176	100
Ontario	162.0	19,807	106,385	87,594	69	26,232	41
Metro Tor.	149.0	18,145	98,547	79,825	63	9,956	16
Quebec	32.0	3,512	35,419	25,096	20		
Western Region	10.5	1,834	6,210	11,936	9		
Maritime	1.5	79	534	1,941	2		

¹All monetary amounts are in thousands of dollars.

Source: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Private Communication.

draw on the cross-Canada interviews reported in Variety's special Canadian industry supplement of November 27, 1985:

(i) Production in Atlantic Region on an Uptick

TV and feature production is increasing, but slowly, in Canada's four Atlantic provinces....

On the go around the province is a low-budget Canadian adventure feature, 'the PURACON Factor,' and 'Frontier', a \$6 million international TV mini-series co-production that also will show in French, England and Toronto...

Telefilm has invested \$1.5 million in 21 independent TV projects, with budgets totalling \$9 million. That compares with eight projects submitted by Atlantic producers the previous two years.

Noting the need for regional programming that would not be aired nationally, (Points East President, Jack McAndrew) complains 'a top-heavy Telefilm bureaucracy' interferes with broadcast licence fees offered by area producers. He cites several cases where Telefilm insisted that CBC licence fees offered producers were too low and that scuppered pending projects. (page 64)

(ii) Under Boisvert's Baton, Quebec Cinemas on Strong Up-beat Course

Nicole M.-Boisvert, President and General Manager of Societe

Générale Cinéma du Québec states in Variety, November 27, 1985:

'I had two principle objectives when I started. First I wanted to get the province's screenwriters writing again and with lots of freedom. To develop a strong film voice indigenous to the Province, one must develop screenwriting talent. And my second objective was to get production in high gear once again...In 1984, under the then-recently created SGC, 12 features, 11 documentaries, 14 TV series and 4 specials were made with the help of SGC Investment. And from January 1, 1985 to the present some 18 feature films in addition to a comparable number of documentaries, TV series and specials have received SGC investment. ... The gate figures for the documentaries we've invested in look good; but, as most are aware, its the features that serve as the best barometer to the world as the state of a nation's cinema. If the feature films are working, all other aspects of the industry should work as well.

(iii) Ontario Film Office Pegs Province's Take at \$78 Million

There are significant economic advantages to program production in Ontario as opposed to the United States. Despite this, and the fact that a large volume of production is continuing to occur in the province, the provincial government has initiated a new incentive program.

The devalued 35-cent Canadian dollar plus deep strength on experienced crews, performers and post-production houses make Ontario the country's leading production centre. So far this year, foreign production, mainly U.S. features and TV pictures, spent \$30,750,000 per Sandra Johnson, consultant with the Ontario Film Video Office.

...Independent Canadian productions spent \$46,900,000 since January, about an \$11 million increase over the same period last year, and attributed it to a sharp boost of investment backing from Telefilm Canada's Broadcast Fund.

Intent on aiding and centralizing, the province's new Liberal government splurged and came up with \$20 million in new money over three years to establish the Ontario Film Development Corp. It will invest with the province's producers in development, production, marketing aid and job training. The Film Video Office will be transferred into it, as will annual provincial grants made to film festivals, the Academy of Canadian Cinema and other industry service groups. (page 44)

In the same article, Toronto-born Los Angeles director Stephen Stearn points out that Ontario has more than economic advantages to offer:

I get a sense of camaraderie and freedom here that I don't get in the States. Here, everyone on the crew is interested. They all go to the rushes. You have that in Hollywood only when you do theatrical features.

One way I sell projects to be done here is say to Home Box Office that they can get Canadian content. Home Box Office hates Canadian content rules but on a \$3 to \$3.5 million project they can get \$1 million of that from Canada and their own money goes farther. The 30-cent Canadian dollar (roughly equal to 30-cents less than the U.S. dollar) is a huge factor. ... U.S. efforts shooting in Toronto and in parts of the province since early January included 'Police Academy III,' some scenes for

'Eleni,' the 'Kane and Abel' miniseries which stayed for three months, 'Perry Mason Returns,' made-for's 'Mafia Princess,' 'Letting Go,' 'Alex, Life of a Child,' 'Alter Ego,' and 'Right of the People,' several episodes of soaper 'All My Children' and ABC's two-parter 'Pippi Longstocking.'

Canadian productions included the Disney-backed \$C10,000,000 feature, 'One Magic Christmas,' HBO's Toronto-linked 'Phillip Marlowe' series, the features 'Separate Vacations,' 'Always Knock First,' and the 'Night Heat' weekly cop series, all from RSL Entertainment, 'Mr. Nice Guy,' 'Pink Chiquitas,' 'Recruits,' 'Graveyard Shift,' and TV series 'The Campbells,' 'The Comedy Factory,' 'Check It Out,' 'The Frantics' and the two-parter 'Anne of Green Gables.' (page 74)

(iv) Alberta Lensing At Good Pace

Since 1982, the Alberta Motion Picture Development Corporation has provided development loans for Alberta Film and Television Producers.

Variety, November 27, 1985 reports that:

a total of eight AMPDC-funded projects have been completed since 1982, with another 33 in various stages of production. To date, the AMPDC has been involved in more than \$15 million worth of production. Among AMPDC projects that have received assistance this year are 'Loyalties,' a feature film budgeted at \$C2,700,000, with a \$C200,000 AMPDC loan; 'Connecting,' a nine-part 'Donahue-type show' for children budgeted at \$C300,000, with a loan of \$C20,000; 'Striker's Mountain,' a \$C2,800,000 feature film, with a \$C200,000 loan; 'Little Vampire,' a 13-part \$C2,000,000 TV series, with a loan of \$C50,000; 'Wildcat,' a \$C400,000 half-hour pilot for a 13-part TV series, with a loan of \$C70,000; and 'Shooting Stars,' a \$C400,000 feature, with a \$C7,000 loan. (page 42)

AMPDC President, Lorne McPherson expressing great satisfaction with this track-record told Variety "in terms of our mandate, to foster an indigenous film and TV industry, we feel we've been very successful."

(page 72) Variety also reports:

In terms of overall results, Bill Marsden, Film Development Officer with the Province of Alberta,

Department of Economic Development estimates that "location shoots and Alberta-based movie and TV production will have left an estimated \$25 million in the Alberta economy by the time 1986 rolls round. ...In fact, I'd say our own people, our own crews have employed pretty much 100%. Before 1985 is over, at least six or seven fairly major projects ('Striker's', 'Connecting', 'Rattails', 'Little Vampire', 'Wildcats', 'Shooting Stars', 'Loyalties') will have been done indigenously with help from Telefilm and the AMPDC (the Alberta Motion Picture Development Corp.). ...Without any sales tax and a dollar exchange favourable to the U.S., this province can be attractive." (*Variety*, November 27, 1985, pp. 41, 70)

(v) B.C. Filming Hits \$135 Million

The province of British Columbia has been on a film making roll since 1979, and 1985 has exceeded expectations of the Film Promotion Office of the B.C. Ministry of Tourism.

In 1984 the total budgets of all theatrical and telefilm productions lensed on B.C. locations reached \$C60,000,000. This year the figure rose to \$C135,000,000 of which \$C60,000,000 was spent directly in the province.

Of the 27 productions that have located in B.C. since January 1, eighteen were U.S. ventures and five of these were U.S. theatrical pics: MGM-UA's 'Rocky IV,' Lorimar's 'The Boy Who Could Fly,' Par's 'Captive Hearts' and 'April Fool's Day,' and ITC's 'Stepfather.'

Of the eight telefeatures made on location in B.C. this year, two were ITC productions - 'Going for the Gold' and 'The Story of Lin Yarn' - two were for CBS airing - 'Picking Up the Pieces' and 'Love, Mary' - and for the first time 20th Fox TV located here with both 'A Letter to Three Wives' and 'Brian Walker - Please Call Home,' the latter a co-production with Ron Howard's Major H company. Total budget for the telefeature activity in the province was \$C42,000,000.

Indigenous film production received a boost from two costly shorts made for the Expo '86 world's fair: Bob Roger's 'Rainbow Wars' budgeted at \$C2,000,000 and Peter O'Brian's Showscan featurette which cost the same amount, and which toplines Fairuza Balk ('Return to Oz').

Indigenous film production also rose sharply last month...with both 'Bullies' and 'High Stakes,' theatrical pics with a combined budget of \$C4,000,000.

In collaboration with the Disney Channel, Toronto producer Paul Saltzman had already committed \$C8,000,000 to a second series of his 'Danger Bay' moppet and family

adventure-drama - 22 further episodes - so that indigenous film activity in 1985 is more robust in B.C. than ever before.

10. INTERVIEWS

This section reviews the opinions and information provided in interviews with Telefilm Canada officials, Department of Communications officials, independent producers, distribution, and broadcasters. A list of those interviewed appears as Appendix A.

(a) Confusion Over the Mandate of Telefilm Canada

Network executives interviewed, identified the basic schizophrenic situation of Telefilm Canada. The agency has both a cultural mandate and an industrial policy mandate. The cultural mandate requires a large dose of programming by and about Canadians. The industrial policy, on the other hand, requires product that can be sold in foreign markets. As CBC executives pointed out, successful pursuit of the industrial development of the television program production industry has resulted in the problematic situation of basically American productions being subsidized by the Canadian taxpayer. They felt there was no question that the cultural mandate of Telefilm should receive precedence. They express concern that programs in the category of art, music and dance were not attracting Telefilm financial support despite their obvious Canadian cultural component. The failure of art, music and dance programs to provide satisfactory financial performance appears to override the value of their cultural contribution.

These broadcasters' views on the relative priority being attached to each of the Telefilm Canada objectives seem to be shared by producers. Mike McMillan of Atlantis Films felt that subsidization of television and film production in Canada was justified in order to provide a return on investment to producers and to permit them to develop self-sustaining series. But, he also noted the cultural impact and enjoyment of such subsidized programs as important values. Pat Ferns felt that drama should be given priority and that incentives should be focused there with performing arts, music and dance a second priority.

There is some confusion amongst those interviewed as to who the Telefilm Broadcast Fund was originally meant to benefit. Producer Francios Champaign of S.D.A. cited a tremendous fear that the Telefilm fund is no longer serving as support for the production industry but rather is being diverted from this original purpose to support the main broadcasters (CBC and Radio Canada). Paul Morton of Global felt the fund was originally designed to help broadcasters at a time of increased U.S. signal availability in Canada i.e., to provide broadcasters with better quality programming to offset the audience fragmentation resulting from the availability of additional American discretionary channels.

(b) CBC

CBC spokesmen declared the CBC to be "totally happy with doing production outside". The CBC's strategy is to gradually reduce their reliance on U.S. entertainment programming at prime time. Each three hours per week

reduction in U.S. programming results in 60 hours per year shifted to the Canadian private production sector. Their target is 50% of (excluding news, current affairs, and sports) programming coming from independent Canadian producers by 1988-89. They feel very strongly that the retention of a core 70 hours per year of in-house drama production is essential to ensure that programs with cultural value but lacking profit potential can still be made. They point out that it would certainly be possible for the government to provide funding directly to the CBC in a separate envelope tied to independent production. They feel the underlying motivation for the Canadian Broadcast Development Fund is the provision of financial assistance to the independent production community without giving the CBC money.

(c) Evaluative Comments on Telefilm Canada

In our interviews with Telefilm Canada officials, they stressed the need to consider general environmental factors as well as actions by Telefilm itself in measuring the impact of the Fund. Strained relations between the CBC and the government, the existence of the Federal Task Force on Broadcasting Policy, the free trade debate, and the Task Force on Feature Films have all led to a climate of great uncertainty. There can be no doubt that in a climate of uncertainty the effectiveness of any investment incentive program is blunted.

There was a general consensus amongst all groups interviewed that it was important that the Fund be operated on a business-like basis. Telefilm officials cited their early difficulties in bringing government officials

around to an entrepreneurial approach to the entertainment industry from their previous granting agency approach. Producer Francois Champagne related the extremely difficult competitive situation faced by private Canadian producers in prior years when the National Film Board and the CBC were receiving heavy direct public funding which enabled them to undercut the private producer.

Spokesmen for Atlantis Films and Global network provided overall evaluations of Telefilm Canada performance as being "wonderful" and "magnificent" respectively. Both were concerned with the question of fiscal responsibility: Atlantis wanting to see Telefilm performing return on investment analysis on a project-by-project basis and Global looking for large enough investments on the part of producers to permit them to retain creative control in their dealings with U.S. broadcasters. Victor Loewy, a distributor, was also concerned that excessively large Telefilm investments might lead to a weakening of market discipline on producers inducing them to tinker with "artsy" rather than commercial product. He also feels that excessing production of Canadian content is killing the market for more meritorious programs. An additional concern was the overhead and paperwork burden involved in the advertising support programs.

(d) Categories of Programs Funded

The entire Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund is designed to be market-driven. By definition, this is bound to set certain constraints on

the type of programming that can be produced with the assistance of the Fund. Both the presidents of Global and Peter Pearson, Executive Director of Telefilm, were agreed that the major partnership opportunities for Canadian independent producers were with off-network outlets. These outlets were characterized by Mr. Pearson as older, richer, growing and more demanding.

The tailoring of Canadian television programs to the need of this audience is resulting in significant changes in their very nature. For instance, although the CBC has expressed the desire to do music programs, it is Telefilm's judgement that such programs cannot be afforded since they offer no financial return relative to their high production cost. Similarly, documentaries are of little interest to Telefilm.

CBC spokesmen identified independent producers as the group responsible for the insertion of documentaries as a category of programming eligible for CBPDF funding in the latest Memorandum of Understanding. This provision is of little significance, however, because of the absence of broadcaster demand for documentaries. The CBC, for instance, stated that they were pulling back from full-length documentaries because of their need for drama programming and especially continuing series in order to maintain audience flow.

(e) Regional Balance

A number of observers interviewed in the course of the study argued that the policy goal of seeking a regional balance in television program

production runs counter to the underlying economics of the industry. For example, Peter Pearson, Executive Director of Telefilm argued that centripetal forces bring top talent towards centers of excellence. Toronto and Montreal were felt to be strong and getting stronger. Mike McMillan of Atlantis Films similarly felt that film and television production would naturally be drawn to the Toronto and Montreal metropolises. David Minsk, President of Global Television, went even further, citing the strong tie of industry production to New York and Los Angeles for North America considered as a whole. The existence of film industry infrastructure and the talent pool in these two centers made it very difficult even to attract production to Toronto or Montreal when one took a larger frame of reference.

(f) Rules Versus Authority

One area in which there was a wide divergence of opinion was on the question of the need for "rules" versus "authority". Stephen Roth, co-chairman of the Federal Government's Task Force on Feature Films was very definite on the need for clear Telefilm guidelines. He felt Telefilm was too slow to respond to producers, too whimsical, and that they didn't respond in a professional business-like way. A response of this nature poses significant administrative costs for producers because of the need for them to go back to their other potential investors and completely renegotiate their arrangements as a result of changes imposed by Telefilm personnel. Roth also felt it was important that Telefilm take a realistic position on Canadian content requirements for projects where they accounted for relatively small proportions of the total budget.

Pat Ferns of Primemedia Productions expressed the need for firm Telefilm Canada guidelines. Without firm guidelines, producers were invariably involved in expensive deal renegotiations as a result of last minute Telefilm decisions. He provided the example of the apparently standard Telefilm practice of seeking a 20% share of recoupement at the first tier while leaving 80% to private investors. The failure to set out rules governing this practice deprives producers of a basis for financial planning. Clear and consistent rules on various matters would limit Telefilm's discretion and reduce their evaluation role. Fern's felt this mode of operation would enable producers to much more efficiently meet the pre-identified constraints and relieve Telefilm of the burden of developing detailed rationales for negative funding decisions.

Stephen Roth took this "rules" case even further arguing that Telefilm Canada should completely abandon their project-by-project approach to financing production and move to providing financial support and commitment to the ongoing production program of proven independents. He also placed a high value on the long-term predictability that such a financing arrangement would provide. Ideally, he would like to see Telefilm take a five-year perspective, to estimate their projected financial support of a given producer, and then to offer the producer say 35% to 40% of the five-year total but to supply this lump sum as a credit facility over the period involved. All profits made over the five-year period would go to the independent producer and thus provide him with very strong incentives to meet market place tests and Telefilm, at the same time, would be able to spread their given supply of dollars over a larger

number of producers. The principle difficulty with this proposal would seem to be the perceptual problems involved in crossing the line from an incentive/subsidy to a grant providing equity capital. Possibly anticipating this criticism, Roth suggested the credit facility might well be in the form of a bank guarantee.

Ian McLaren and Judith McCann of Telefilm Canada do not share this viewpoint. They feel the biggest advantage of the Fund is precisely that it is not a regulatory approach, nor a mechanical rule like the capital cost allowance provision, but rather a discretionary policy agency requiring operational flexibility to attain its goals and objectives. They consider the main problems that have arisen in the operation of the Fund have been as a result of limits placed on its flexibility by the original Memorandum of Understanding as in the case of the lack of money for script development. In their view, what Telefilm needs is a clear statement of goals and objectives and discretionally authority sufficient to achieve these goals.

Interviews with Telefilm officials revealed some of the difficulties encountered in one "rules" setting. The 1985 Memorandum of Understanding provided for up to 49% Telefilm involvement subject to projects meeting the CRTC 10 point Canadian content formula. Rather than providing Telefilm with flexibility to provide additional funding for French-language, regional, and special cultural significance programming, the 49% ceiling became a de facto floor with producers approaching Telefilm with projects qualifying under the 10 point formula and demanding

the full 49% assistance. This experience would appear to lend support to the view of Mike McMillan of Atlantis Films that "discretion is what makes things happen."

(g) Assessment of Needs for Changes in the Fund

There are a wide range of views on what might be the best way to restructure Telefilm broadcast fund incentives. One proposal, put forward by both the CBC and Mike McMillan of Atlantis Films, is that Telefilm should provide their support on a fixed dollar rather than a percentage basis. The actual dollar amount of a particular type of programming could be set to reflect the underlying economics and the perceived cultural significance. Moving away from a percent of budget system would eliminate the problem of artificial budget inflation which serves only to unrealistically reduce the rate of return for Telefilm and other investors.

On the other side of the coin is the need identified by Telefilm and by Global Television for some tie between the broadcast licence fee and the Telefilm contribution. As Telefilm have argued so persuasively in their November 29 submission to the Federal Task Force on Broadcasting Policy, Telefilm incentives should be structured to provide an incentive for broadcasters to offer much larger broadcast licence fees. From the viewpoint of the private producer, Pat Ferns argues that some method must be found to provide producers with a return from sales to the domestic market of at least 80% of their cost outlays on a program. He points out

the case of Channel 4 in Britain which is financed by a levy on the ITV companies and devotes 90% of its total revenues to the purchase of independent productions. Canadian producers must look to Canadian markets for the major source of their revenues rather than counting on foreign sales. Spokesmen for Global agree that the present situation requires Canadian producers to achieve major portions of their cost recovery in foreign markets. They feel the real American market for Canadian producers is in syndication and independent stations rather than the networks. The problem is that this market provides little opportunity for pre-commitment to productions and therefore Telefilm Canada plays an important role in providing up-front money to Canadian producers.

There seems to be a strong case for higher broadcast licencing fees. The questions are, is it possible to raise the licence fees and how might this best be done?

Peter Pearson, Executive Director of Telefilm Canada, argues that not only should resources be shifted from broadcasters to the independent production sector but that the financial resources are there to be shifted. The CBC is publicly funded and for them, shifting from in-house production at 100% of budgeted cost to independent production at a licence fee of say 50% would result in a 50% cost saving. The private broadcasters, sheltered from competition by the government, have been earning super-normal profits and can well afford broadcast licence fees amounting to 50% of cost. But how can this brought about?

As Denis Harvey and Rudi Carter of the CBC point out, the present low level of licence fees result from two different factors. The CBC suffered a substantial budget reduction a year ago. When the Fund maximum contribution was increased to 49% to attract the CBC back into the Fund, they lowered their licence fees to the 17% level in order to get as many hours of programming per dollar of CBC outlay as they could. On the other hand, private broadcasters had been relatively uninterested in the Fund when the maximum Telefilm investment was one-third. Restoration of broadcasting licence fees to more realistic levels (from the viewpoint of producers) would seem to require some type of Telefilm matching formula (suggested by Pat Ferns and CBC spokesmen amongst others). The present Fund provisions for matching licence fees are not widely used since most projects submitted to Telefilm qualify under the ten points out of ten points rule for 49% funding. Therefore, private producers have applied directly for the maximum support and not bothered with the matching provisions. Telefilm's announced intention to move away from the 49% criterion opens up the possibility of an operational broadcast licence matching scheme.

Pat Ferns suggested one head-on approach to the broadcast licence fee problem. The government could just supply the CBC with a "third envelope" of funding designated only for purchase of product from independent Canadian producers. This direct demand side support would, of course, permit the CBC to offer higher broadcast licence fees. Telefilm spokesmen identified one significant political difficulty involved with this approach, namely the fact that the CBC is meant to be operating at arm's length from the government and accordingly should be making its own

decisions as to where and what to purchase in terms of programming. Tapping the super-normal profits of the private broadcasters was deemed to be a job for the regulators - a job which they had failed to do in the past. Paul Morton, President of Global Television, had a useful suggestion. He proposed a formula, whereby a 15% broadcast licence fee would be sufficient to trigger the Fund and that Telefilm would match the broadcaster dollar for dollar up to a 35% licence fee. This would insure economic viability for the broadcasters while going some way to meet the producers financial needs. He felt it would be quite acceptable to have different rules for French-language versus English-language programming and also that there should be more rigorous rules for the CBC and CTV as compared to independents who have a smaller market.

Another aspect of this is the absolute size of the Telefilm contribution to particular projects. It is easy to understand the desire of Telefilm management to lever the Fund as much as possible in order to generate the largest possible production volume for the given amount of resources provided by the government. But, Stephen Roth provides an important cautionary note. If Telefilm concentrates on the commercial viability of projects and attempts to minimize its financial involvement in each of them, it could quickly find itself in the position of being a minority partner in a large number of projects over which it had little creative control and was therefore completely unable to achieve the cultural goals originally set out for the program.

One obvious way to increase the number of hours of programming produced with any given budget is to reduce the average cost per program. Pat

Ferns makes the case that Canadian feature films must be made on smaller budgets than has been the case because of the small Canadian market and the limited distribution support available in that market. He points out, for example, that a \$600,000 feature film can be profitable in Quebec but \$6-10 million English-language feature films are not feasible in Canada. Telefilm Canada have been told by Canadian broadcasters that feature films are not a broadcaster priority and that they will not be issuing letters certifying a broadcasting commitment on them in the immediate future. This fits in with Telefilm's present desire to stretch its budget over a larger number of projects but it certainly lends support to the case of Francois Champagne and Nicholl deRoche of SDA, who point out that if CBC and CTV are writing to broadcasters to say they will be committing to fewer feature films at the same time as there is very limited interest by private investors in the area then clearly some policy response is called for. There would seem to be little merit in swinging wildly over a very short time period from a heavy emphasis on feature films to a complete de-emphasis to make way for broadcast programming. The availability of Canadian content product for Pay-television is also a factor here.

Another issue that arose is how best to structure the financial support for continuing series. Telefilm Canada, in their latest round of discussions with industry participants proposed a schedule of declining support:

1st year series	25%
2nd year series	20%
3rd year series	15%
subsequent years	10%

This is a difficult area since Telefilm, understandably, do not wish to overly concentrate their entire resources in the series area. But, on the other hand, continuing series are very attractive to broadcasters because of the audience loyalty they can build. Both Mike McMillan of Atlantis and Denis Harvey and Rudi Carter of the CBC made a strong case for making every effort to extend support to a successful series sufficient to permit it to build to the level of 65 episodes. Only at this level of total production is a series attractive to the profitable syndication after-market. What appears to be called for is a schedule of declining support - but not declining to the extent that successful series are dropped too early.

11. ECONOMIC RATIONALE FOR A SUBSIDY THROUGH TELEFILM CANADA

Various arguments have been put forward for subsidizing Canadian television program production. We will evaluate three of the more serious contenders, namely the positive externality argument, the infant industry argument, and the employment opportunities argument.

The positive externality reason has been supported by a number of authors including Hoskins and McFadyen (1984), Boardman and Vining (1984), and Lyon and Trebilcock (1982), the latter with respect to the feature film industry. Positive externalities are the benefits to Canadian society resulting from citizens being exposed to additional Canadian programming. A subsidy is justified in terms of market failure as the private sector receives remuneration for television programs primarily on the basis of number of people watching but does not receive payment for promoting an

increased sense of Canadian identity or awareness of Canadian themes and values amongst those viewing. Hence the private sector, in the absence of a subsidy, will produce less than an optimal amount of such programming. The decision whether to subsidize thus has to be based on the judgement that the benefits from the positive externalities outweigh the dollar cost of the subsidy necessary to induce the additional programming. This is a difficult judgement to make but there is no doubt that positive externalities do exist for some programming and we would support their subsidization on this basis.

The infant industry argument is that a country may have a comparative advantage in production of a product or service that it does not presently produce and a subsidy, or protection from foreign competition, is necessary while the industry becomes proficient in the relevant technology and engages in a learning process.

There is some reason to suppose that Canada does have a comparative advantage with respect to television program production. Paul Morton, of Global, told us that production costs in Canada in terms of Canadian dollars are equal to production costs in the U.S. in terms of U.S. dollars. This suggests Canadian costs are 30% to 40% less than U.S. costs for similar productions. Details on the reasons for this cost spread are contained in the article "Costs in Canada: What's Cheap, What's Steep", Variety, November 27, 1985, p. 41 which revealed that:

Aside from the favourable 35 cent dollar exchange, there are considerable overall savings for U.S. productions done in Canada. ...film processing costs 8.5 cents a linear foot compared to an average of 13 cents a foot U.S. Work prints, negative transfers and other post-production costs are 20 to 30% less; set construction, location fees, vehicle rental and catering each about 20%.

Crew rate, wardrobe and props are basically the same but are somewhat offset by the devalued dollar. Equipment rental is about 20% higher because most equipment is imported from the U.S. and stiff duties are paid. If U.S. distributors route Canadian post production costs to their Canadian office, they avoid a 15% federal withholding tax charged on royalties paid to U.S. corporations from Canadian income.

Under agreement with producers, the 7,500 Alliance of Canadian Television and Radio Artists (ACTRA) offers pre-payment option alternatives to residuals scheme in force in the U.S. Producers, foreign or otherwise, may pay a lump sum of 125% step-up fee to performers for five years in each medium from the date of first year in each medium. That could be extended for a further five-year period. "That's much cheaper than pay as you go," per Ray Stringer ACTRA's Toronto representative. "SAG and AFTRA traditionally favour residuals. The other option in Canada is pay as you go and if so, there is a 30% step-up for each medium."

Paul Morton also indicated that, in the early days of Telefilm Canada, U.S. financial participants were reluctant to go along with use of Canadian personnel in key production and acting positions, but having seen how these people can perform they are now eager to use them.

As Lyon and Trebilcock have noted, with respect to the feature film industry, "the companion theory (to the infant industry argument) is that the economics of the film industry require government stimulation of massive amounts of production to foster an infrastructure that can eventually support the production of culturally significant films."

We are inclined to accept the validity of the infant industry argument with respect to production of television programming, but it is important to realize that this argument can only be used to support a temporary subsidy. The subsidy should be phased out when the industry has been established and the infrastructure is in place.

justification has to be on the basis of the cultural significance to Canada of the output rather than merely the nationality of the inputs. From this viewpoint, the CRTC ten point scale is largely irrelevant. An aspect of the regulations governing the Telefilm Canada Fund which is relevant to the positive externalities rationale is the choice of categories of programming which are eligible for the Fund. Drama, variety, children's, and documentary programming are types where a good argument can be made for the existence of positive externalities.

Insofar as drama reflects and enhances an appreciation of and an identification with Canadian themes, values, history, and institutions, this category has significant externalities and is worthy of support. Not all drama does this, however. The danger with international co-productions is they may lose any Canadian distinctiveness. Even where no foreign money is involved there may be incentive for the producer to downplay any distinctiveness in the hope this will make it more acceptable to a foreign audience. For example, with respect to "Night Heat", shown on CTV, a critic (Remington, September 8, 1985:C4) writes:

The sad thing for this Canadian-made series is that Toronto isn't Toronto. It's just an unnamed, typical big city that is supposed to pass for New York, Philadelphia, Chicago or if you want, Toronto. That's because 'Night Heat' is also running in the U.S. on CBS.

John Reynolds, General Manager of British Broadcasting Corporation's Co-productions states that the BBC does not follow this strategy.

Firstly, we do not make "international" programs. We make programs to inform and entertain the British television audience. Nevertheless, we are both commercially and socially delighted, if they appeal to foreign viewers. Despite the need for co-production money, I see absolutely no sign of wavering on this basic principle. (Reynolds, July 11, 1985:16)

A subsidy for children's programming that is distinctive can be justified on similar grounds to those of drama. This is again an area of serious deficiency with English-speaking children spending more than 80% of their viewing time watching U.S. programming (Juneau, May 9, 1985).

Positive externalities for documentaries can be justified on the grounds they lead to a more knowledgeable, better-informed population. We are somewhat less convinced with respect to the extent of positive externalities for variety.

12. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Telefilm Canada fund has obviously been successful, at least from April 1, 1985, in stimulating independent program productions. Nevertheless we believe the recommendations that follow are in order.

(a) A Two-Tier level of Telefilm Canada funding with the First Tier Phased out after Several Years

The analysis in Section 10 on the economic rationale for a subsidy suggests the following. During the period, we suggest to mid-1988, in which the infant industry argument remains valid, there should be a two-tiered level of Telefilm Canada funding. Programming, which does not have indigenous distinctiveness or cultural significance (such programming has been described to us by Mike McMillan, Atlantis Films, as "American clone programming") should receive the base level of support. Programming that can claim cultural significance, and hence eligibility under the

positive externality argument, should receive an additional level of funding. After the phasing out of support based on the infant industry argument, only programming which can be justified by positive externalities should receive Telefilm Canada support.

The way this might work in practice is that during the interim period all projects which qualify under the ten point system, based on use of Canadian inputs, would automatically qualify for a base level of Telefilm Canada support as long as they could raise the rest of the financing elsewhere and get a letter of intent from an eligible Canadian broadcaster. Additional Telefilm funding would have to be specifically applied for and Telefilm Canada would make a judgment on the basis of the positive externalities/ cultural significance of the output. After the interim period, with the infant industry argument no longer applicable, private producers could apply for Telefilm Canada funding only on the basis of the cultural significance of the program.

There is reason for concern that in recent months Telefilm Canada have been over-emphasizing rate of return considerations and under-emphasizing cultural significance. In our discussions with Telefilm Canada officials, fiscal responsibility and the need to get a good return on taxpayers' money was emphasized. Peter Pearson notes in Variety, November 27, 1985, that Telefilm's legislation has not changed since it was founded as the Canadian Film Development Corp. in 1968. That is:

to assist in the promotion and development of the film industry in Canada.

We do not think that mandate is out-of-date at all, its always been the only point in our legislation we administer the broadcast fund under contract to the

Department of Communications. We are constantly discussing all ways to cause that to happen. Not only in terms of creating production, but creating labs, facilities, studios and distribution. ... Telefilm really exists as a public venture capital fund. We exist essentially to follow market forces. We are minority financing and if any such feature film initiative should take place, we would expect to follow the same parameters. (page 44)

Andre Picard, Director of the Broadcast Fund also appears to place industrial development ahead of cultural goals. In summing up his evaluation of the Fund's performance to Variety, November 27, 1985, he concludes, "the most important result is the overall hours that have been produced by independent Canadian producers: 450 hours since April 1, more than last year and about 75% of the total in the first two years, that for us is our measure of success." (page 92)

In addition, CBC officials, and a private producer, recounted the rejection of three CBC arts and music programs. Although this type of programming is eligible for Telefilm Canada funding, it appears that these programs were rejected by Telefilm Canada on commercial grounds. Telefilm Canada appears to be putting little weight on the cultural significance of programming and yet in the long run this is the only sound economic justification for subsidization through such a body.

(b) Restructuring of the Broadcast Fund Incentive Formula

The existing incentive formula used in the Broadcast Fund has two shortcomings: use of a percentage formula to calculate the Telefilm Canada contribution leads to administrative effort to control budget

inflation and the high Telefilm percentage used has caused broadcasters to minimize the dollar amount of their broadcast licence fees.

The simplest way to deal with the first problem is to move directly to the provisional support of a fixed dollar rather than a percentage basis. If considered in conjunction with the two-tier level of support program outlined in Section (A) above, this fixed dollar amount could be viewed as the dollar cost of achieving the development of the private Canadian program production industry during its infant phase.

The use of the fixed dollar investment while dealing with the problem of artificial budget inflation would also, by removing a matching of larger budgets, result in some tendency to lower cost programming. The actual dollar amount of the investment for each particular program category would have to be set (with an inflation factor) at a level that would permit the provision of quality Canadian offerings.

On the question of achieving larger broadcast licence fees clearly what is required is some type of matching formula. What we recommend is that the basic flat dollar investment, designed to move the production industry out of the infant industry phase, be coupled with a dollar for dollar matching program by the Broadcast Fund of all amounts invested in the project in the form of broadcast licence fees. Thus, for example, in the case of a project involving a one hour program budgetted at \$800,000 rather than a 49% Telefilm contribution of \$394,000 a basic \$100,000 plus a matching of say the next \$200,000 of broadcast licence fee would bring the producer a total of \$300,000 from the Broadcast Fund and \$200,000 from the broadcaster.

- (c) Provide the CBC with new financing ear-marked exclusively for independently-produced Canadian programming

One policy suggestion raised by several persons interviewed (presumably on the basis of a manifesto supported by the entire Canadian production industry, as well as the relevant unions and trade associations) was that the CBC be provided with a special envelope of financing tied to purchase of programming from the independent production sector. This would ensure that the CBC was fully able to access the Fund, possibly permit more continuing series to be produced, and most importantly would permit a restoration of a more reasonable level of broadcast licence fees. From the CBC's viewpoint this would, of course, facilitate the process of attaining higher levels of Canadian content during prime time. Since the only drawback of this approach appears to be the conflict with the political goal of perceived budget cutting at the CBC it seems to be an option worthy of serious consideration. Political damage could be contained by linking the new ear-marked fund with some additional general CBC budget reduction. Even if the amount of the reduction and the ear-marked fund were equal, the CBC's programming capability would be increased through the leveraging available through the Broadcast Fund.

Alternatively, a straight increase in the CBC's budget for private program production could be implemented without reducing their resources in other areas. Such an increase could come directly from general revenues or as the "Friends of Public Broadcasting" have suggested in their "An Open Letter to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney on Public Broadcasting" (The Globe and Mail, December 14, 1985, page A11) by a tax on private broadcasters.

Of course, if the value of the special envelope was large enough that CBC licence fees increased to around 70%-80% of production costs, Telefilm Canada funding would not be necessary for independent productions exhibited by CBC. This would be simpler and more efficient but politically difficult.

(d) Broaden the Broadcast Fund to encompass feature film production

Independent production of feature films in Canada has received substantial support from the Broadcast Fund since its inception. Only in recent months has the fund moved away from features because of a desire to support a larger volume of television programming. This broadening could be achieved by permitting film distributors and pay-television services to access the fund with letters of commitment.

There is no clear-cut case either for or against such a broadening of a Fund. The major concerns seem to center around the limitations imposed on the Fund's activities when its limited budget is allocated to a relatively small number of large projects. Another factor is that the product of pay-television projects may only be accessible to a limited number of Canadian viewers. On the other hand, if additional resources are to be devoted to the support of the feature film industry, the Fund could be expanded to encompass this type of product and thereby permit producers of larger projects the usual three "windows" (theaters, pay-television, broadcast television) for their more costly programs. The demand pressures on the Broadcast Fund would be more representative of the overall demand situation for television programming in Canada. Of course,

a desire to respond to the "media power" issue might dictate the establishment of new broadcast funds each of which covered both television programming and feature films.

(e) Regional programming

Guidelines have been set out for English/French allocation of the Broadcast Fund (two-thirds to English-language programs and one-third to French-language programs) and to public/private allocations (fifty percent as a maximum for the public sector) but no guideline has been established for the allocation of funds to regional programming. Although it would be unwise to burden the administrators of the Broadcast Fund with too many constraints it might be useful to set out a guideline target for the portion of Fund which was appropriate for ear-marking for regional (i.e., outside Montreal and Toronto) production. A realistic target would have to recognize the economies associated with geographical concentration of production facilities, talent, and expertise. A cautionary note is provided by the observation that there are only two major production centres in the U.S.

(f) Administrative Matters

The Broadcast Fund has been the subject of three evaluations within the last year. These evaluations and the routine financial reporting requirements of Telefilm Canada have each required a succession of manually prepared analyses of various Telefilm internal information. The time and effort required to produce these reports indicate that Telefilm

Canada requires, at least on a consulting basis, access to some senior level accounting/management information systems advice so that they will be able to produce this kind of documentation routinely from properly constructed data bases.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Parts of this report draw freely, without further reference, from forthcoming papers entitled "The New National Broadcasting Strategy: An Evaluation and Some Recommendations", Canadian Public Policy, and "The Whys and Wherefores of Television Broadcasting Regulations and Incentives", Proceedings of 'Challenge of Change' Symposium, Faculty of Business, University of Alberta.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Applebaum, L. and J. Hébert et al, Report of the Federal Cultural Review Committee, Ottawa (November 1982).
- Audley, P., Canada's Cultural Industries, Canadian Institute for Economic Policy, Ottawa (1983)
- Boardman, A. and A. Vining, "Canadian and British TV Markets: Why The CBC Should Not Be Like The BBC," Canadian Public Policy, September 1984, pp. 347-351.
- Canadian Film and Television Association, Report to the Task Force on Broadcasting Policy, Toronto (October 1985).
- CRTC, Special Report on Broadcasting in Canada 1968-1978, Volume 1, Ottawa (1979)
- Enchin, H., "Film Industry Struggling to Make Impact Abroad," Globe and Mail, September 9, 1985, p. 12.
- Fraser, M., "Riding the TV Bandwagon," Globe and Mail, November 10, 1984, p. E1.
- Hoskins, C., and S. McFadyen, "The Role of the CBC in the Canadian Broadcasting System: Revisited," Canadian Public Policy, September 1984, pp. 352-358.
- Juneau, P., Address to the 94th Annual Banquet of the Greater Moncton Chamber of Commerce, Notes, May 9, 1985.
- Lapointe, A., and J. Le Goff, Television Programs and their Production in Canada, Department of Communications, Ottawa (1980).
- Lillico, D., The Canadian Film Development Corporation: A Report on Financial Incentives as Mechanisms for Achieving Compliance with Agency Objectives, January 31, 1985.
- Lyon, S., and M. Trebilcock, Public Strategy and Motion Pictures, Ontario Economic Council, Toronto (1982).
- Masse, M., Statement by the Minister of Communications concerning changes to the Canadian Broadcasting Program Development Fund, Toronto, Ontario, March 15, 1985.
- McFadyen, S., C. Hoskins, and D. Gillen, Canadian Broadcasting: Market Structure and Economic Performance, Institute for Research on Public Policy, Montreal (1980).
- McQueen, D., "Alternative Scenarios in Broadcasting," Canadian Public Policy, March 1983, pp. 129-134.
- Memorandum of Understanding, February 21, 1983.

Memorandum of Understanding, March 15, 1985.

Minister of Communications, Government of Canada, Towards a New National Policy, Ottawa (March 1983).

Remington, R., "Canadian Cop Show in the Cold of Night," Edmonton Journal, September 8, 1985, p. C4.

Reynolds, J., "Co-production - Where the BBC Stands," The Stage and Television Today, July 11, 1985, p. 16.

Shields, R., "CBC Gets Down to Business," The Financial Post, August 31, 1985, p. 14.

Telefilm Canada, Annual Report 1983-1984, Montreal (1984).

Telefilm Canada, What Happened in Year One, Montreal (1984).

Telefilm Canada, Annual Report 1984-1985, Montreal (1985).

Telefilm Canada, The Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund After Two Years, Montreal (1985).

Telefilm Canada, "Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund: Status of Applications and Financial Analysis, April 1, 1985, to October 31, 1985," Tables supplied to the authors.

Telefilm Canada, Discussion Paper on Telefilm Canada's Business Plan for 1986-87, November 1985.

Telefilm Canada, Financing Canadian Television Production, a paper submitted to the Caplan - Sauvageau Committee, November 1985.

Worron, T., "Shortage of Top Serials Big Problem for CBC," Edmonton Journal, October 7, 1984, p. B16.

Variety, "Imports of Films for TV and TV Programs," May 9, 1984, p. 303

Variety, "Global Prices for TV," August 29, 1984.

Variety, November 27, 1985

APPENDIX A

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

AUDLEY, Paul, Executive Director, Federal Task Force on Broadcasting Policy

CARTER, Rudi, Director, Independent Production, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

CHAMPAGNE, Francois, Président, SDA Productions Ltée

FERNS, Paterson, Co-President Association of Canadian Film and Television Producers (ACFTP)

HARVEY, Denis, Vice-President CBC English Network

HELM, Michael, Director, Broadcasting and Content Services Policy Branch
Department of Communications

IRONSIDE, Ian, Senior Policy Analyst, Broadcasting and Content Services
Policy Branch, Department of Communications

LOEWY, Victor, Vivafilm

LAPOINTE, Alain, Directeur, Institut d'économie appliquée, Ecole des
Hautes Etudes Commerciales

LE GOFF, Jean-Pierre, Professeur agrégé, Institut d'économie appliquée,
Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales

MINTZ, David, President, Global Television Network

MORTON, Paul G., President, Global Television Network

PEARSON, Peter, Program Director, Telefilm Canada

RILEY, Ted, Director, Marketing and Distribution, Atlantis Television
International Inc.

ROBERT, Denise, Directrice générale adjointe, Société générale du cinéma
du Québec

de ROCHEMONT, Nicole, Vice-présidente, producteur, SDA Productions Ltée.

ROTH, Stephen, Co-President (ACFTP)

SERAFINI, Shirley, Director General, Broadcasting and Content Services
Policy Branch Department of Communications

APPENDIX B

The Way Out of the Crisis

The central cultural organization in Canada is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It does not exist for itself but for all Canadians. The institution is in crisis and thus the crisis touches us all. We believe there is a way out.

We urge the Minister of Communications to recommend immediately that Parliament vote a special envelope of monies for CBC earmarked exclusively for independently-produced Canadian programming. This idea was first presented to the Canadian Radio Television and Telecommunications Commission during the CBC licence renewal hearings in 1978. In the recent past, special funds have been voted for CBC for Olympic coverage, for transmitters for the North, for the visit of the Pope, and for Gala concerts for the Premier of China and the President of the United States. We believe that the goals of Canadianization of the CBC and of increased privatization of production are events of comparable cultural importance.

We recommend that the level of funding of this special envelope be \$35 million in 1984 dollars, which will enable CBC to pay realistic licence fees to independent producers of drama, variety, children's and other programming, thus enabling CBC to take advantage of the monies potentially allocated to it by the Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund.

The Fund, administered by Telefilm Canada, was created to give opportunity to a wider segment of the Canadian artistic community to communicate with all Canadians. It is an instrument which leaves decisions of what is produced to the broadcaster, whether public or private, while encouraging independent producers to generate more Canadian content programs for Canadian audiences.

CBC played its part in this process during the first year of the Fund's operation, but now argues that it can play no longer. Thus, it is reversing its commitment to open up creative opportunities for independent producers to complement the production of programs made by its own producers. Also, it has postponed plans for the further Canadianization of CBC. This is a denial of two vitally important policies.

The real problem of Canadian television is the underfunding of the production of Canadian programs from whatever source. The solution we propose will enable CBC to pursue its professed goals and will not undermine its integrity as the publisher of a truly Canadian television service. CBC will decide what is produced; but Canadian creative talent, both inside and outside CBC, will have the opportunity to entertain and inform the Canadian viewing public.

THE WAY OUT OF THE CRISIS

A Manifesto Supported by

Ad Hoc Committee of Independent Canadian Filmmakers
Alberta Motion Picture Industries Association (AMPIA)
Alliance of Canadian Television and Radio Artists (ACTRA)
Association of Canadian Film Craftspeople (ACFC)
Association of Canadian Film & Television Producers (ACFTP)
Association des producteurs de films du Québec (APFQ)
Association québécoise des distributeurs et exportateurs
de films, de télévision et vidéo (ADFQ)
Association québécoise des industries techniques du cinéma
et de la télévision
British Columbia Film Industries Association (BCFIA)
Canadian Association of Motion Picture Producers (CAMPP)
Canadian Association of Motion Picture and Electronic Recording
Artists (CAMERA)
Canadian Conference for the Arts (CCA)
Canadian Film and Television Association (CFTA)
Canadian Independent Film Caucus
Directors Guild of Canada (DGC)
Producers' Committee for Children's and Family Television
Syndicat des techniciennes et techniciens de cinéma du Québec (STCQ)

January 15, 1985

APPENDIX C

List of Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund Projects

- i. Annual Report, 1983-1984, pp. 15-20
- ii. Annual Report, 1984-1985, pp. 19-30
- iii. Information Report on the production contracts signed between April 1st and September 30th, 1985, 4 pp.

The Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund English Projects

Title	Director	Production Company/ Producer	Performers
At First Sight	Stephen Onda	Framework Prods. Inc. Stephen Onda	Veronica McDonald Wayne Hronek Grant Lowe Margaret Woodward Jeanette Groemendyk
Bay Roy (The)	Daniel Petric	Bay Boy Prods. Frank Jacobs	Kiefer Sutherland Leah Pinsent Liv Ullmann
Canadian Literature Series John Cat A Good Tree Bambinger Painted Door Cages One's A Heiffer A Cap for Steve All the Years Of Her Life	Wolf Keening Giles Walker Doug Jackson Bruce Pitman Michael Scott Anne Wheeler Robert Duncan Don McBrearty	Atlantis Films Ltd Michael MacMillan Janis Platt Seaton McLean	Jim Herman Les Ruby Peter Boretsky August Schellenberg Chris Owens Robert Clothier TBA Jackie Burroughs
Country Wife	John Thomson	Renaissance Prods. John Thomson	Cedric Smith Edward Atienza Graeme Campbell Domini Blythe Susan Morgan
Dancing Feathers	Eric Jordan	Spirit Bay Prods. Paul Stephens	Cynthia Debassige Colleen Loucks Diane Debassige Gary Farmer Ron Cook
Fingers In The Sun (Listen To The City)	Ron Mann	Sphynx Prods. Ron Mann	Barry Callaghan Sandy Horne
First Choice Rocks	Various	WBC Prods. Ltd William Ballard	Various
Gift (The)	Hugh Beard	Merv Campone Prods. Ltd Ltd/Artray Ltd Merv Campone	Tom Heaton Liza Haldane Kevin Easby
Hockey Night In Huntsville	Paul Shapiro	Martin-Paul Prods. Ltd Martin Harbury	Rick Moranis Megan Follows
Joined At The Hip	Pierre Sarrazin	Pierre Sarrazin Prods. Inc. Pierre Sarrazin	Chas. Lawther S. Couture
Just Jazz	Henry Sauver- Foner	Visual Prods. '80 Ltd Lionel Shenken	Heather Smith
Kangazoo Club (Tho)	William Elliot Bruce Raymond	Bruce Raymond Prods. Melissa Glarota	Russell Chong
Prodigal (Tho)	Allan Kroeker	Burbank Prods. Stan Thomas	Ed McNamara August Schellenberg

Title	Director	Production Company/ Producer	Performers
Take My Husband ... Please	Corrine Farago	Comedy Films Inc. Corrine Farago	Katie Ford Maria Lukofsky Sheila Gostick Marjorie Gross
Toronto Trilogy The Golden Promise Streetwise Between Neighbours	Mario Azzopardi	Chum-City Marcia Martin Mario Azzopardi	Anthony Parr Lynne Griffin Wayne Best Helen Hughes R.H. Thomson Harvey Atkin Nick Mancuso Wendy Bushell John Evans
Unfinished Business	Don Owen	Zebra Films Ltd Annette Cohen Don Owen	Isabelle Mijias Peter Spence Peter Kastner Julie Biggs
Waiting For The Parade	Robin Phillips	Primedia Prods. Ltd Richard Nielsen	Martha Henry Carole Shelley Susan Wright Donna Goodland Sheila McCarthy
Walls	Tom Shandel	Jericho Films Ltd Michael Chechik	Andrée Pelletier Winston Rekert
Wildfire: The Story Of Tom Longboat	David L. Tucker	DLT Prods. David L. Tucker	Terry Harford Allan Royal Fern Henry-Pearsons Irving Layton Bruce Kidd

French Projects

Crime d'Ovide Plouffe (La)	Gilles Carle Denys Arcand	Ciné Plouffe II/ICC Denis Héroux Justino Héroux	Gabriel Arcand Anne Létourneau Denise Filiatrault Jean Carmet Véronique Jannot Juliette Huot Pierre Curzi
Dame en couleur (La)	Claude Jutra	Productions Pierre Lamy Liée Pierre Lamy	Paule Baillargeon Rita Lafontaine Gilles Renault
Divine Sarah (La)	Danielle Suissa	3 Thèmes Inc. Danielle Suissa Yvette Brind'Amour	Monique Leyrac
Femme de l'hôtel (La)	Léa Pool	ACPAV Bernadette Paveur	Paule Baillargeon Louise Marleau

Title	Director	Production Company/ Producer	Performers
Enfants mal aimés (Les)	Roger Trétreault	Productions du Verseau Inc. Aimée Danis Éric Fournier	Michel Goyette Guy Thauvette Christine Olivier Chantal Goyette Louisette Dussault Paul Savoie Marie-Chantal Label Raymond Legault Michelle Magny
Festival juste pour riro 1983 (Un)	Jacques Méthé Bernard Picard	Films Rozmond Inc. Gilbert Rozon	Yvon Deschamps Jean-Guy Moreau Marc Favreau Normand Brathwaite
Guerre des tuques (La) (Le château de neige)	André Melançon	Productions La Fête Inc. Rock Demers Nicole Robert	Cédric Jourde Maripierre Arseneau-D'Amour
Légendes du monde	Bruno Carrière Belkacem Bazi Jorge Fajardo Daniel Bertolino Raoul Held	Productions Via le Monde Inc. Daniel Bertolino	TDA
Louisiane (two contracts)	Philippe de Broca	Ciné Louisiane (ICC) John Kemeny Denis Héroux	Margot Kidder Ian Charleson Andréa Ferreol Len Cariou Lloyd Bochner
Mélodie ma grand-mère	Stella Goulet	Spirafilm Jean Tessier	Olivette Thibault André Cailloux Jérôme Fortin
Musique Nothing Else (E = Rock')	Guy-Hans Simoneau	Productions Cénatos Inc. Pauline Geoffrion	Spa Romance Madame The Box Musical Digital Print
Nicole Martin et Michel Louvain	Pierre Lacombe Michel Préfontaine	Spectel Vidéo Inc. Disques Star Records Inc. Daniel Harvey André Dicesare	Nicole Martin Michel Louvain Melody Stewart Danielle Licari Martine St-Clair
Objet (L')	Roger Cantin Danyèle Patenaude	ACPAV Lucille Veilleux	Serge Thériault Louise Rinfret
Petit Prince Made in Québec (Le) (Cher monsieur l'aviateur)	Michel Poulette	ACPAV Marc Daigle	Claude Maher Paul Savoie Michel Daigle
Sang des autres (Le)/Blood of Others (two contracts)	Claude Chabrol	Ciné Simone Inc. (ICC) John Kemeny Denis Héroux	Jodie Foster Michael Ontkean Sam Neill Stéphane Audran Lambert Wilson

Regular Fund English Projects

18

Title	Director	Production Company/ Producer	Performers
American Century	Michael MacLear	Cineworld Inc. Michael MacLear	
Arnold Spohr And The Winnipeg Ballet	Gabriel Markin	O'Meara Prods. Jan Carlo Markiw	Arnold Spohr and the Winnipeg Ballet
Balconville	Mark Blandford	Carlton Prods. Ltd Gary McKechar	Jane Eastwood Marc Gélinas Peter MacNeil
CKND Series		Canwest Broadcasting	Cedric Smith Elen Ross Gibson Alexe Duncan Jean-Louis Hébert Fred Tenner Susan Wilkes John Innes Adam Brooker
In The Fall The Hunting Season Reunion	Allan Kroeker Allan Kroeker Frank Adamson	Stanley Thomas	
Crosspoints	Francine Flemming	Reel Films Ltd Paul Pope	Daniel MacIvor Uda Hodder Ross Manson
Draw	Stephen Stern	Astral Films Prods. Ron Cohen	Kirk Douglas James Coburn
I Am A Hotel	Allan Nichols	Blue Memorial Video Ltd Barrie Wexler	Leonard Cohen Toller Cranston Ann Ditchburn
Kids Of Degrossi St.	Kit Hood	Playing With Time Prods. Linda Schuyler	Typhon Talbot Jamie Summerfield Bree McKibbin Sarah Charlesworth
Loose Scrows (Camp Bottom Out)	Miklos Lente	Maurice Smith Prods. Maurice Smith	Konnie Krome Mike MacDonald Wally Wodchis Foster Brooks Donnie Bowes Milan Cheylov
Maggie And Pierre	Martin Lavut	Tapestry Prods. Rick Butler	Linda Griffiths
Masters Of The Performing Arts	J. Anthony Robinson	Carlona Prods. Ltd S. Anthony Robinow	Jean-Pierre Rampal Paco Rena Dorothy Taubman
Québec/Canada 1995	John McGreevy	Primedia Prods. Richard Nielsen	Albert Millaire Louise Marleau Kenneth Welsh Martha Henry John Neville Jackie Burroughs

Title	Director	Production Company/ Producer	Performers
Rainbow Series Ounce of Cure Home From Far Caroline White Lies Cornet At Night Jo's Song	Don McBrearty Bruce Pitman Peter Shatalow Don McBrearty Bruce Pitman Seaton McLean	Atlantis Films Michael MacMillan Floyd Favei	Martha Cronyn Kathy Burns Fiona McGillivray Simon Craig Joanna Schellenberg August Schellenberg Stephanie Morganstern Virginia Thomas Andrew Skelly R.H. Thompson Marilyn Lightstone Rebecca Flemming Lisa Ann Turina
What Is To Be Done	George McGowan	Gabor Apor and Company Ltd Gabor Apor	Donna Goodhead Margot Dionne

French Projects

Années de rêve et de révolte (Les) (Les années de rêves)	Jean-Claude Labrecque	Films Vision 4 Inc. Claude Bonin	Gibert Sicotte Anne-Marie Provencher Monique Mercure Amulette Garneau
Caffè Italia	Paul Tana	ACPAV Marc Daigle	Pierre Curzi Toni Nardi
Connaissance du milieu	Jean-Louis Frund	Productions Jean-Louis Frund Inc. Clément Beaudoin	
Crime d'Ovide Plouffe (Le)	Gilles Carle Denys Arcand	Ciné-Plouffe II Inc. Denis Héroux John Kemeny	Anne Létourneau Gabriel Arcand Denise Filiatrault Jean Carmet Véronique Jannot Juliette Huot Pierre Curzi
Défi mondial (Le)	Daniel Bertolino Daniel Creusot	Productions Via le Monde Inc. Daniel Bertolino	
Étau-bus (L')	Alain Chartrand	ACPAV Michel Gauthier	Louissette Dussault Julie Vadboncoeur Sophie Vadboncoeur
Étoiles de demain (Les)	Gary Toole	SDA Productions Ltée François Champagne	
Îles de Mingan (Les)	Claude Bélisle	Productions Cinexpio Inc. Claude Bélisle	

Title	Director	Production Company/ Producer	Performers
Jacques et Novembre	Jean Beaudry François Bouvier	Productions du Lundi Matin Inc. Marcel Simard François Bouvier	Jean Beaudry Jean Mathieu Reino France Marie Cantin
Mer et ses princes (La)	Jean-Paul Plouffe Normand Allaire	Ciné-Groupe J.P. Inc. Jacques Pettigrew	
Pour faire un film	Robert Sésé	Société d'Édition et de Montage Audio-Visuel Inc. Robert Sésé	
Prendre la route	Donald Brittain	Idéacom Inc. Jacques Nadeau	
Rotoscopie	Bruno Carrière	Films Cinétrie Inc. Bruno Carrière	
Sweathop électronique (La)	Sophie Bissonnette	Productions du Regard Inc. Jean-Roch Marcotte	

The Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund English Projects — Dramas

Buyo	Mort Ransen	Jape Film Services Inc. Harry Gulkin	Mort Ransen Terry Ryan Arnie Gelbart (after a novel by Chipman Hall)	Ed McNamara Patricia Phillips Stephen McGrath Cedric Smith Hugh Webster
Blue Line	Marc F. Voizard	Les Productions de la Chouette Inc. Tom Berry/ National Film Board Stefan Wodslawsky	Tom Berry Stefan Wodslawsky	David Matheson Isabelle Mejias
Borrower (The)	Peter McCubbin	Emmeritus Productions Peter McCubbin	Peter McCubbin	Jeff Holec Jan Taylor
Boy in Blue (The)	Charles Jarrott	Regatta Productions John Kemeny	Douglas Bowie	Nicolas Cage Christopher Plummer Cynthia Dale David Naughton Melody Anderson Sean Sullivan
Bradbury Trilogy (The) - The Crowd - Marionettes, Inc. - The Playground	Ralph Thomas Paul Lynch William Fruet	Atlantis Films Ltd. (Canada) Wilcox Productions Inc. (U.S.A.) Seaton McLean	Ray Bradbury	- Nick Mancuso Robert H. Thomson David Hughes - James Coco Leslie Nielsen Jayne Eastwood Kenneth Welsh - William Shatner Keith Dutton Kate Trotter Marko Malish
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

**Canadian Literature
Series II**

- To Set Her House in Order	- Anne Wheeler	Atlantis Films Ltd.	- Anne Wheeler	- Tom Heaton
- Uncle T.	- Doug Jackson	Michael MacMillan/ National Film Board of Canada	- Gerald Wexler	- Doris Petrie
- Esso	- Don McBrearty	Andy Thomson	- Linda Svendsen	- Gordon Pinsent
- Connections	- Wolf Koenig		- Kelly Rebar	- Linda Sorenson
- Concert Stages	- Giles Walker		- Seaton McLean	- TBA
- Rebellion of Young David	- John Smith		- John Smith	- TBA
- Chiclet Gomez	- Paul Shapiro		- John Frizzel	- Angus Mackay
- The Trumpeter	- Janice Platt		- Janice Platt/ TBA	- Patricia Phillips
- The Dream and the Triumph	- Bruce Pittman		- Jim Purdy	- TBA
- Mortimer Griffin and Shalinsky	- Mort Ransen		- Gerald Wexler	- TBA
- The Sight	- Francis Mankiewicz		- Brian Moore	- Paul Selts
- Legs of the Lame	- Bruce Pittman		- Bruce Pittman	- Ron Lea
- Going to War	- Carol Moore-Ede		- Joe Wiesenfeld	- Cedric Smith
- Jack of Hearts	- Cynthia Scott		- Jack Blum	- Frances Hyland
- Hot walker	- Gil Cardinal		- Jim Delehee	- TBA
- Fred	- Harvey Spak		- Ruth Andriashak	- Neil Munroe
- Red Shoes	- Allan Krocker		- Nancy Botkin	- TBA
- Capital	- Allan Krocker		- Allan Krocker	- TBA
				- Ed McNamara
Close to Home	Frederick G. Beairisto	The Hy Perspectives Media Group Inc. Harvey Crossland	Frederick G. Beairisto	Jilian Fargey Daniel Allman Anne Petrie John Destry-Adams Dorothy Jones
On Boom	Stuart Allan	Resource Films Ltd. Stuart Allan	Andy Jones Mike Wade Mary Walsh Rick Boland Ray Guy Greg Malone	Andy Jones Mike Wade Mary Walsh Rick Boland Ray Guy Greg Malone
Danger Bay	Gilbert Shilton Allan Eastman Michael Berry Stuart Margolin	Danger Bay Productions Inc. Paul Saltzman	John T. Dugan Nancy Ann Miller Don Balluck Rick Drew Christopher Haddock	Donnelly Rhodes Deborah Wakeham Christopher Crabb Ocean Hellman
Father Christmas	Philip Borsos	North Pole Picture Co. of Canada Inc. Peter O'Brian	Thomas Meehan	Mary Steenburgen Harry Dean Stanton
Frankenstein Factor (The)	Jean-Claude Lord	Frank and Stein Film Productions Inc. John Dunning Don Carmody	David Preston Edith Rey	Teri Austin Richard Cox Pam Grier Maury Chaykin David Mellwraith
Fun Park	James Orr	Filmline Productions Inc. Pieter Kroonenburg David Patterson	James Orr James Cruickshank	Carl Marotte Thor Bishopric Carolyn Dunn Rachel Hayward
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

Heritage Theatre	Nigel Napier-Andrews	My Country Productions Elsa Franklin	Lister Sinclair	Elsa Franklin Pierre Berton
Les Littlefeathers	Les Rose	Lauren International Inc. William Johnston Barry Pearson	Les Rose Barry Pearson	Will Korb Scott Highlands Lou Jacobi
Job (The)	Jim Swan	Points East Productions Inc. Niall Burnett Luciano Lisi	Larry LeClair	Barry Dunn Kent Stetson Faith Ward
Joshua Then and Now	Ted Ketcheff	RSL Entertainment Inc. Robert Lantos Stephen J. Roth	Mordecai Richler	James Woods Gabrielle Lazure Alan Scarfe Kate Trotter Alexander Knox Alan Arkin
King of Friday Night (The)	John Gray Andrew Gosling	Canamedia Productions Les Harris	John Gray	Eric Peterson Frank Mackay Geoffrey Bowes Alex Willows Andrew Rhodes Sherree Jeacocke
Labour of Love	René Bonnière	Primedia Productions Richard Nielsen	Richard Nielsen	Tom Butler Michele Scaramelli Booth Savage Jim Bearlen Sheila McCarthy Diana Reis Don Francks
My American Cousin	Sandra Wilson	Peter O'Brian Independent Pictures Production/Borderline Productions Inc. Peter O'Brian	Sandra Wilson	Margret Langrick John Wildman
My Kind of Town	Charles Wilkinson	Milltown Pictures Inc. Cal Shumatcher	Charles Wilkinson	Peter Smith John Cooper Michael Paul Martina Schliessler Michael Marks
Night Magic	Lewis Furey	RSL Entertainment Corporation James Kaufman (Canada/Fildebrog Michelle de Broca (France)	Lewis Furey Leonard Cohen	Nick Mancuso Carole Laure Stéphane Audran Jean Carmet Frank Augustyn Louis Robitaille
Point of Escape	Allan Eastman	Illumine Productions Ltd. William Marshall	Jim Osborne Julius Kohanyi	Helen Shaver Kenneth Welsh Ingrid Venning Jason Hopley
Samuel Lount	Laurence Keane	Moonshine Productions Ltd. Elvira Lount	Phil Savath Laurence Keane	Robert H. Thomson Linda Griffiths Cedric Smith
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

Time of Your Life	Harry Jakobs	Harry Jakobs Breakthru Productions Harry Jakobs	Harry Jakobs Jeff Rosen	Tanya Williams Howard Rosenstein Linda Singer Robin Brown Bruce Ramsay
Toby McTeague	Jean-Claude Lord	Filmline Productions Nicolas Clermont	Jamie Brown	Yannick Bisson Winston Reckert Andrew Bednarski
Tramp at the Door	Allan Kroeker	Burbank Productions Stan Thomas Don Briton	Allan Kroeker	Ed McNamara August Schellenberg Monique Mercure
Wildcat	Don McBrearty	Wildcat City Productions Nick Bakyta Michael MacMillan	Roy Sallows	TBA

English Projects — Children's

Connecting	Robert Groves	HBW/Toth (Co-Production) Helene White Garry Toth	Sally Banks	Reiner Schwarz
Edison Twins II (The)	Allan Eastman Ron Kelly Clive Smith Mario Azzopardi Eric Till	Nelvana Limited Patrick Loubert	David Young Paul Ledoux Patrick Loubert Elaine Waisglass Steve Wright Bruce Martin Susan Snooks	Sunny Besen Thrasher Marnie McPhail Andrew Sabiston
Edison Twins III (The)	Allan Eastman Ron Kelly Clive Smith Mario Azzopardi Eric Till	Nelvana Limited Patrick Loubert	David Young Paul Ledoux Patrick Loubert Elaine Waisglass Steve Wright Bruce Martin Susan Snooks	Sunny Besen Thrasher Marnie McPhail Andrew Sabiston
Elephant Show (The)	Stan Swan	Cambium Film & Video Production Ltd. Bruce Glawson Arnie Zipursky	Mark Shekter	Sharon Hampson Lois Lilienstein Bram Morrison Eric Nagler Paula Gallivan
Fubulous Festival	Tony Gilbert	Heritage Festival Society Tony Gilbert	Barbara Nichol	Al Simmons
Family Entertainment Package (The)	Pino Van Lamsweerde	Animated Investments Inc. Alison Clayton	Gerald Tripp Mary Crawford Allen Templeton Lynn Johnston	
Free to Fly	Hilary Jones Janet Abramoff	Breakthrough Production Co. Joy Simons	Hilary Jones	Tamsin Jones Coad Puppets
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

George and the Star	Gerald Potterton	Canadian International Studios Inc. Murray Shostak	Gerald Potterton	
Insight Package - Dark But Full of Diamonds - Tucker and the Horse Thief - Working for Peanuts	- Claude Jutra - Allan King - Martin Lavut	Insight Productions Iain Paterson/ Scholastic Productions (USA) John Matoian Jane Startz	Marisa Gioffre Mary Pleshette Willis	- Lance Guest Wendy Crewson Tom Hauff Helen Hughes - Sarah Doyd Hadley Kay Ken Pogue Hrant Alianak Sheila McCarthy - Carl Marotte Jessica Steen Shawn Thompson August Schellenberg Mary-Ann Coles
Kids of Degrazi Street	Kit Hood Linda Schuyler	Playing with Time Inc. Linda Schuyler Kit Hood	Michelle Dionne John Bertram Susan A'Court Yan Moore	Matthew Roberts Arlene Lott Danah Jean Brown Jamie Summerfield Neil Hope Tanya Schmalfluss
Little Vampire (The)	René Bonnière	Little Vampire Productions Limited Richard Nielsen John Rosa	Richard Nielsen	TBA
Michael's Fright	Michael Rubbo	Les Productions La Fête Inc. Rock Demers	Michael Rubbo	Mathey Mackay Allison Podbry Michael Hogan
Raccoons (The)	Kevin Gillis	Evergreen Raccoons Television Productions Inc. Kevin Gillis	Kevin Gillis Derek Diorio Carol Bolt Dan Lalonde B.P. Nichol	Michael Magee Len Carlson Marvin Goldhar Carl Banas Linda Feige Sharon Lewis
Rocket Boy	John Blanchard	Nelvana Limited Patrick Loubert Michael Hirsh	Dave Thomas	Dave Thomas Mark Parr Ron James Cathy Loskey James Doug Robert Donner
Russian Adventure	Paul Lang	Primedia Production Paterson Ferns	Gerald Durrell	Gerald Durrell Lee Durrell
Spirit Bay	Eric Jordan Paul Stephens	Spirit Bay Productions Inc. Paul Stephens Eric Jordan	Amy Jo Cooper Keith R. Leckie Linda Zwicker	Cynthia Debassige Trevor Smith Mark Bruder Ron Cook Liza Haldane Cheri Maracle
Sports Cartoons	Derek Lamb	Lamb Perlman Production Derek Lamb	Derek Lamb	
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

Tales of Wesakechuk	Burton Smokey Day	Storytellers Production Limited Marla Dufour Burton Smokey Day	Tantoo Martin Marla Dufour	Tantoo Martin
Vid Kids	John Muller	M&M Film Productions Limited John Muller Tom Reynolds	Janis Nostbakken John Muller	Bob Schneider Peter Jarvis Rocco Bellucci Alyson Court Richard Yearwood Natalie Margitta
Welcome to My World	Ian Murray Rick Watts	Glen Waren Productions Limited Mary MacPherson	Mary MacPherson	Brian Armstrong Marylou Bassaraba Tanya Williams Danielle Kiraly Kent Frost

English Projects - Varieties

Bach Fantasy (A)	Barbara Sweete Larry Weinstein	Rhombus Media Inc. Niv Fichman Louise Clark	Niv Fichman Louise Clark	Anner Bylsma Keith Jarrett
Bold Steps - The National Ballet of Canada	Cyril Frankel	Primedia Productions Limited Paterson Ferns		The National Ballet of Canada
Christmas Skating Special	David Acomba	Aptel Producers Corporation Paul Palmer	Jack Bondi Paul Palmer	Toller Cranston
Claire: Mission 84	Trevor Evans	Aptel Producers Corporation John Delmage	Paul Palmer Pat Withrow Sterling Hicks	Robert Benson Robin Gammel Peter Boretski Jackeline Mahon Helen Hughes Michael Kirby
Dick Rivers Show (The)	Gary Plaxton	Canadian Music Television Limited Gilles Chartrand	Michei Mongeau Serge Chapleau Peter Torkvai	
En scène 85	Bernard Picard	Spectel Video Daniel Harvey		Corey Hart
Floating: The Flight of the Tango Gulf November	Peter Thurling	Peter Thurling Productions Limited Joan Schafer	Peter Thurling	Murray McLauchlan Levon Helm Ian Tyson Sylvie Tremblay Buffy Ste. Marie Edith Butler Gordon Lightfoot
Frantics (The)	David Acomba	Painless Productions Morgan Earl	Paul Chato Rick Green Dan Redican Peter Wildman	Paul Chato Rick Green Dan Redican Peter Wildman
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

Mediapark Package	Tony Gilbert	Mediapark Inc. Alex Park	Tony Gilbert	Victoria Symphony Orchestra
MSO/Messiah Handel	Bernard Picard	Chaplain Productions Inc. Don Forsyth		The Montreal Symphony Orchestra
Party with the Rovers	Michael Watt	Olympic TV. Productions Inc. Ken Gibson		The Rovers
Premieres	John Coulson	Mediapark Inc. Alex Park		Adrienne Clarkson Maureen Forrester Orford String Quartet Société de musique contemporaine du Québec
Quintet - Visions of Five	David Acomba Richard Leiterman John McGreevy Cynthia Scott Eric Till	Vision 5 Productions John McGreevy	John McGreevy	
Rich Little and Friends in New Orleans	Michael Steele	Steele Goulet Productions Michael Steele Paul Goulet	Bob Arnott Michael Steele Paul Goulet	Rich Little Jim Carrey Danielle Brisebois The Nylons Honeymoon Suite
Rock Revue '84	Don Allan	D'Allan Film and Video Productions Inc. Don Allan Peter Goddard	Peter Goddard	Terry David Mulligan Samantha Taylor
Rocky Mountain Christmas with Frank Mills	Michael Watt	Olympic Television Productions Inc. Ken Gibson	Alan Thicke	Frank Mills Toni Tennile Carroll Baker Shari Lewis Platinum Blonde Underhill and Martini Robert Pilon
Rocky Mountain Inn	Dan Parrish	Calgary Television Limited Dan Parrish	Thomas Parker Gallant	Ronnie Prophet
Singin' and Duncin' Tonight	Norman Sedawie Gayle Gibson Sedawie	T.A.D. Productions Inc. Norman Sedawie Gayle Gibson Sedawie	Aland Lund	The 1984 cast of the Charlottetown Festival
Street Comedy	Bill Hartley John Kastner	Kastner Kandida Productions Limited Bill Hartley	Bill Hartley	John Kastner
Unknown Comic (The)	Harvey Frost	James Shavick Film Companies James Shavick		Murray Longston Ted Ziegler Evan Carter
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

The General Production Program English Projects

Assignment Adventure	William Johnston	Lauron Productions Limited William Johnston Ronald Lillie	William Johnston/ TRA	
Compulsion	Ida Eva Zielinska	Les Productions Ida Eva Inc. Ida Eva Zielinska	Ida Eva Zielinska	
Peter Ustinov's Russia	John McGreevy	Pushkin Productions John McGreevy Victor Solnicki	John McGreevy	Peter Ustinov
Ranch	Steven Denure	Cinapse Productions Inc. Christopher Lowry Steven Denure	Christopher Lowry Steven Denure	Allan Wood
Regeneration	Russell Stephens	International Heliotrope Limited Tony Dean	Russell Stephens	John Anderson Marek Cieszwski Suzanne Ristic Dermot Hennelly Len Greenwood
Solo	David P. Hauka	Hauka Films Inc. David P. Hauka	David P. Hauka	Owen Montague
Transplant	Steven DiMarco	Transplant Pictures Limited Steven DiMarco	Steven DiMarco	Doug Stone Eugene Amadeo Andy Adach

The Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund French Projects — Dramas

Amour de quartier (Un)	Robert Ménard	Les Productions Vidéofilms Ltée Robert Ménard Monique Messier	Claire Wojas Robert Ménard	Olivette Thibault Jacques Godin Roger Le Bel Jean Dalmain Pierre Curzi Guy L'Écuyer Linda Sorgini
A plein temps	François Côté Michel Bériault	Les Productions S.D.A. Ltée François Champagne	Joanne Arseneau Elisabeth Bourget René Gingras Paule Marier Marie Perreault Michèle Poirier Louise Roy Francine Tougas	Claude Prigent Diane Jules Raymond Cloutier Louison Danis-Collin Rita Bibeau Suzanne Champagne
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

Clémence Alletti	Peter Kassovitch	Les Productions Roger Héroux Inc. Roger Héroux/ Société nationale de télévision en couleur Antenne 2 Jacques Trébouta	Jacques Kiraner	Michel Forget Robert Rivard Dominique Labourier Bernard Le Coq
Dis-moi le si j'dérange	Daniel Roussel	The James Shavick Film Companies James Shavick	Janette Bertrand	Juliette Huot Michel Jasmin Ginette Reno
Double Jeu	Suzy Cohen	Suzy Cohen	Suzy Cohen	Doris Blanchet Jean-Marie Bioteau Lucie Laurier Sébastien Brossard
Elvis Gratton	Julien Poulin Pierre Falardeau	Association coopérative de productions audio- visuelles Bernadette Payeur	Pierre Falardeau	Julien Poulin Denise Mercier
Évangéline Deusse	Danièle J. Suissa	3 Thèmes Inc. Danièle J. Suissa Yvette Brind'Amour	Antonine Maillet	Viola Léger Guy Provost André Cailloux Jean Lapointe Tony Van Bridge Jan Rubes Leo Leyden
Gazl el Banat	Jocelyn Saab	Cinévidéo Inc. (Canada) Justine Héroux/ U.P.C.I. (France) Gabriel Boustani	Gérard Brach	Jacques Veber Claude Préfontaine Denise Filiatrault Juliette Berthe Alla Bassam
Lune de miel	Patrick Jamain	Corporation Image M & M Lée René Maïol/ Les Productions Oz Inc. Xavier Gelin (France)	Patrick Jamain Philippe Sethon	Nathalie Baye Richard Barry Marla Lukowsky John Shea
Matou (Le)	Jean Beaudin	Ciné Le Matou Inc. / Initial Groupe Film A2 Justine Héroux	Lise Lemay-Rousseau (after the novel by Yves Beauchemin)	Serge Dupire Monique Spaziani Jean Carmet Julien Guiomar Guillaume Lemay-Thivi Miguel Fernandes
Paroles et musique	Elie Chouraqui	Canadian International Studios Inc. Robert Baylis et Murray Shostak/ 7 Films Cinéma (France) Elie Chouraqui	Elie Chouraqui	Catherine Deneuve Christophe Lambert Richard Anconina Dayle Haddon Nick Mancuso
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

Petite Fleur	Gilles Noël	Les films de la Pleine Lune Inc. Claude Cartier René Pothier	Gilles Noël	Huguette Oligny Marie-Hélène Paquin Anne Caron Raymond Cloutier Françoise Lemaitre-Auger Yvan Ponton Julien Poulin Anouk Simard
Petits contes cruels (Les) - Petites cruautés (Les) - Terrapène (La)	Michel Bouchard	Cinékina Inc. Michel Bouchard/ Ciné Groupe Inc. Jacques Pettigrew	Michel Bouchard (after two short stories by Patricia Highsmith)	- Anne-Marie Ducharme Carmen Tremblay - Julien Davy Alexandra Stewart
Pluie d'été	François D'Auteuil	Les Productions S.D.A. Ltée Louis-Georges Têtreault	François D'Auteuil	Paul Hébert Linda Sorgini Jean Guy
Sacré Tango	Frank Le Flaguais	Association coopérative de productions audio- visuelles René Pothier	Frank Le Flaguais	Christian Vidosa France Morais Ginette Grenier
Ti-Coq	Gratien Gélinas	Fridolinades Inc. Michel Gélinas	Gratien Gélinas	Alain Gélinas Gilbert Sicotte Rita Lafontaine Janine Sutto
Vau-y, Stéphanie!	Bernard Dansereau	Les Films de l'Esquif Inc. Danny Chalifour	Bernard Dansereau	François Frigon Eric Langlois François Chénier Roger Binette Véronique Aubut Georges Laferrière
Visage pâle	Claude Gagnon	Les Productions Yoshimura-Gagnon Inc. Yuri Yoshimura et Claude Gagnon/ Art Theater Guild of Japan Limited Shiro Sasaki	Claude Gagnon	Luc Matte Denis Lacroix Allison Bastien Marcel Leboeuf Guy Thauvette Gilbert Sicotte

French Projects — Children's

Astro le petit robot	Daniel Bertolino	Les Productions Via le Monde Inc. Daniel Bertolino	Daniel Bertolino	
Crèche du village (Lu)	Gilbert Gratton	Télépro Inc. Yves Plouffe	Gilbert Gratton	
Héritage 2001	Gaston Gagnon Marie Larouche	Groupe en Communications Coscient Inc. Laurent Gaudreault	Laurent Gaudreault Marie Larouche	
Livre ouvert	Claude Godbout Réal Tremblay	Les Productions Prisma Inc. Marcia Couëlle	Claude Godbout Réal Tremblay	
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

Truquenaards (1 and 2)	Bruno Carrière Raoul Held	Les Productions Via le Monde Inc. Daniel Bertolino	Jacques Jacob Bruno Carrière Grégoire Viau	Alexis Martin Xavier Mienniel Jean-François Guem
------------------------	------------------------------	--	--	--

French Projects – Varieties

En scène 84	Bernard Picard Pierre Lacombe Michel Préfontaine	Spectel Vidéo Daniel Harvey		Corbeau Kate & Anna McGa
En scène 84	Bernard Picard Pierre Lacombe Michel Préfontaine	Spectel Vidéo Daniel Harvey		Pierre Bertrand Daniel Lavoie
Grands ballets polonais (Les)	Dominique Delbast	Fridolinades Inc. Michel Gélinas		Les Grands ballets polonais
Juste pour rire 1984	Jacques Méthé Laurent Larouche	Les Films Rozon Inc. Gilbert Rozon		
Lautrec 85	Michel Préfontaine	Les Productions Riviera Inc. Donald Lautrec		
Orange électrique	Carl Brubacher	Les Productions de la Chasse-Galerie Inc. Michel Lemieux	Carl Brubacher Plume Latraverse Yves Ouellet	Plume Latraverse and Les Mauvais Compag
Pour une chanson	Jacques Payette	Les Productions Hommages Inc. Nicole de Rochemont	Yves Taschereau Michel Trouillet- Collet	Clémence Desrochers Jean Lapointe Jacques Normand Monique Leyrac Jean-Pierre Ferland Pauline Julien Gilles Vigneault Ginette Reno Yvon Deschamps Louise Forestier Michel Rivard Edith Butler Luc Plamondon Michel Drucker
Variétés Michel Jasmin	Dominique Delbast Laurent Larouche	Jastar Télévision Inc. Michel Gélinas		
Voyage dans le temps (Un)	Jacques Méthé	Sogestalt 2001 Inc. Rénald Paré	Yvon Deschamps	Yvon Deschamps

The General Production Program French Projects

Annapurna 1	Louis Craig André Laperrière	Les Productions Oz Inc. Pierre Gendron	Louis Craig André Laperrière	
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

Aune Trister	Léa Pool	Les Films Vision 4 Inc. Claude Bonin/ Office national du film Roger Frappier	Léa Pool Marcel Beaulieu	Albane Guilhe Louise Marleau Hughes Quester Guy Thauvette Kira Yaroshevskaya
Apocalypse Carle	Raymond Dupuis	Les Productions Pégase Raymond Dupuis	Raymond Dupuis	
Femme en Inde (La)	Laurette Deschamps	Ciné-Contact Inc. Michèle Renaud Molnar	Laurette Deschamps	
Femme et le sport (La) (You've Come a Long Way Ladies)	Roger Cardinal	Sportfilm Inc. André Racine Joseph Beaubien	Jamie Brown	
Fil d'Ariane (Le)	Josée Beaudet	Les Productions de la Marée Montante Inc. Denis Dupont	Josée Beaudet	
Frère Marie-Victorin (Le)	Jean Duval	Ciné-Mundo Inc. Pierre Valcour	Jean Duval Louis Gauthier	
Gens du fleuve (Les)	Monique Crouillère	Les Productions du Regard Inc. Jean-Roch Marcotte	Monique Crouillère	
Justice blanche	Françoise Wera Nathalie Barton	InformAction Nathalie Barton	Françoise Wera	
Limites du ciel (Les)	Yvan Dubuc	Association coopérative de productions audio- visuelles Marcel G. Sabourin Marc Daigle	Yvan Dubuc	
Lotos-Millionnaires (Les)	Michel Moreau	Educfilm Inc. Michel Moreau	Michel Garneau Michel Moreau Jean-Guy Moreau	Guy L'Ecuyer Gilbert Sicotte Jean-Guy Moreau
Magiciens du grand écran (Les)	François Floquet	Les Productions Via le Monde Inc. François Floquet	François Floquet	
Maillardville: mémoire et conscience	Pierre Grenier	Nuance Productions Limited Jean-Camille Geoffroy	Pierre Grenier	
Vidangeurs (Les)	Camille Coudari	Association coopérative de productions audio- visuelles René Gueissaz	Camille Coudari	
Voyage en couleur (Le)	Pierre Savard	Iris Cinéma-Télévision Inc. and Publicitel Inc. Mario Verdon	Marie Verdon	
Zone de turbulence	Nathalie Barton Jean-Claude Burger Gérard Le Chêne	InformAction Jean-Claude Burger Gérard Le Chêne	Nathalie Barton Jean-Claude Burger Gérard Le Chêne	
Title	Director(s)	Production Company(ies)/ Producer(s)	Scriptwriter(s)	Performer(s)

FONDS DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE LA PRODUCTION D'EMISSIONS CANADIENNES/CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUND
DOCUMENT D'INFORMATION sur les contrats de production signés entre le 1er avril et le 30 septembre 1985
INFORMATION REPORT on the production contracts signed between April 1st and September 30, 1985

TELEFILM CANADA

Annulation report of the production contracts signed between April 1st and September 30, 1985						
TITRE/TITLE	Cie de production/Production Co.	Éditeur		Nbre d'épisodes No. of episodes	Durée approximative Approx. running time (minutes)	Date d'achèvement Completion Date
		Broadcaster				
DRAMA/TIQUES FRANÇAISES/FRENCH DRAMA						
Qui a tiré sur nos histoires d'amour...	Maison des Quatre Inc.	SRC	1	120	86/03/01	
Pouvoir intime	Films Vision 4 Inc.	SRC	1	100	86/02/01	
Page trois	Rose Films Inc.	SRC	1	55	85/05/30	
Du poil aux pattes comme les CHAC's	Films Stock Ltée	SRC	1	75	85/09/15	
Lune de miel	Corporation Image M & M Ltée	T.-M.	1	90	86/01/01	
Manon	Productions du Verseau Inc.	SRC	26	30	85/12/03	
Hold-Up	Cinévidéo Inc.	SRC	1	100	85/09/01	
Avec assurance	Suzy Cohen & Information	SRTQ	1	30	86/04/01	
Claire cette nuit et demain	Cléo 24 Inc.	SRTQ	1	90	85/12/01	
A plein temps II	Productions S.D.A. Ltée	SRTQ	36	30	85/09/03	
Enfant douze (L')	Ateliers Audio-visuels du Québec	SRC	1	80	86/05/30	
Cap Lumière	Ciné Est en action/East in Motion Inc.	SRC	1	25	85/12/31	
Courant d'automne	Films Vision 4 Inc.	SRC	1	90	87/06/01	
Dernier havre (Le)	ACPAV	SRTQ	1	75	86/04/15	
Lance et compte (pilote)	Productions Lance et compte Inc.	SRC	1	60	85/12/01	
ENFANTS - FRANÇAIS/CHILDREN - FRENCH						
Bande à Ovide (La)	Ciné-Groupe J.P. Inc.	SRC	65	13	87/09/01	
C'était aussi Noël	Productions C.R.M. Inc.	SRC	1	52	85/08/31	
Manipule	Films Cenatos	SRC	13	5	85/11/15	
Aventure Torngat	Productions La Sterne Inc.	SRC	1	6	85/09/20	
Livre Ouvert II	Prisma Inc.	SRC	13	24	85/09/30	

TITRE/TITLE	Cie de production/Production Co.	Télédiffuseur Broadcaster	Nbre d'épisodes No. of episodes	Durée approximative Approx. running time	Date d'achèvement Completion Date	page
VARIÉTÉS FRANÇAISES/VARIETY - FRENCH						
Vidéoclips Piché, Rivard, Séguin	Spectel Vidéo Inc.	SRTQ	4	5	85/09/01	
En Scène 85 (SRTQ)	Spectel Vidéo Inc.	SRTQ	8	57,5	85/12/20	
En Scène 85 (C. Lara)	Spectel Vidéo Inc.	SRC	1	57	85/05/30	
Rideau	Rideau Inc.	SRC	1	60	85/03/01	
Samedi de Rire	Productions Samedi de Rire Inc.	SRC	26	60	85/10/04	
Juste pour Rire 85	Films Rozon Inc.	SRC	7	60	85/09/01	
Téléclip	ACPAV	SRTQ	1	27	85/09/30	
Variété du siècle	Entreprises Laprade Ltée	SRTQ	1	60	85/09/01	
Découv'Rire 85	Films Rozon Inc.	SRTQ	6	60	85/09/30	
Country Chaud	Télé-Acadie Inc.	SRC	13	30	85/10/01	
En Scène 85 (T. Bennett)	Spectel Vidéo Inc.	SRTQ	1	60	85/09/01	
En Scène 85 (Uzeb)	Spectel Vidéo Inc.	SRC	1	60	95/09/01	
Cirque du soleil (Le)	Productions Fil de Fer Inc.	SRC	2	60	85/11/30	
DOCUMENTAIRES FRANÇAIS/FRENCH DOCUMENTARIES						
Reve de voler (Le)	Productions Vent d'Est Inc.	SRTQ	1	56	86/04/30	
Picasso	ACPAV	SRC	1	60	85/11/01	
Ça c'est du ciboulot	Imageries P.B. Ltée	SRTQ	1	60	85/12/01	
Faune Nordique	Jean-Louis Frund Inc.	SRTQ	6	25	85/07/01	
Présence française en Colombie-Britannique	Okeanon Films Inc.	SRC	3	38,5	85/06/20	
Honde des odeurs (Le)	Ciné-Mundo Inc.	SRC	1	60	86/01/15	
Choix d'un peuple (Le)	Films de la Rive Inc.	SRTQ	1	90	96/01/01	
Soleil dans la nuit	Zolov Productions Inc.	SRC	1	30	85/08/15	
Une journée dans la vie du Canada	G. Ste-Marie & Associés Inc.	SRC/CBC	1	58	85/06/15	
Pellán	Films Vision 4 Inc.	SRC	1	60	85/05/01	
Arts sacrés au Québec	Films François Brault	SRC	12	30	85/08/29	
Défi mondial (prêt)	Productions Via Le Monde Inc.	SRC	-	-	85/12/01	
Film officiel: Québec 1534-1984	Productions de la Saga Inc.	COGECO	1	60	05/09/15	

TITRE/TITLE	Cie de production/Production Co.	Éditeur/Broadcaster	Hors d'épisodes No. of episodes	Durée approximative Approx. running time (minutes)	Date d'achèvement Completion Date
DRAMATIQUES ANGLAISES/ENGLISH DRAMAS					
Window (The)	Doomsday Studios Ltd.	CBC	1	28	86/09/01
Blue Man	Film Line International Inc.	Global	1	90	87/04/01
Windows	Chum Atlantic Programs Inc.	Atlantic TV	6	30	86/01/01
Anne of Green Gables	Visual Productions '80 Ltd.	CBC	4	48.75	85/11/15
Niagara Repertory Co.	Exile Productions Ltd.	CHCH	6	95	85/09/02
Overnight	Lauron Productions Ltd.	CKVU	1	100	86/08/31
No Surrender	Loyalities Film Productions Inc.	CBC	1	100	86/01/01
Loyalities	289201 Alberta Ltd.	CBC	1	100	85/01/01
Striker's Mountain	Atlantis Films Ltd.	Global	1	55	85/08/21
Time for Miracles (A)	Primedia Productions Ltd.	Global	6	60	86/07/01
Frontier	Moviecorp VII Inc.	CTV	7	47	85/08/16
Night Heat	Settler Film Productions	CTV	22	24	85/09/30
Campbell's (The)	Danger Bay Productions Inc.	CBC	22	28	86/01/10
Canger Bay Series II	East in Motion Films Inc.	CBC	1	26	85/11/29
Getting to Work	Films Allegro Inc.	CFCF	1	94	87/06/01
Huggers	Brother Goose Productions Inc.	CBC/8CTV	6	30	
Brothers By Choice	Brother Goose Productions Inc.	"	1	90	
Goosebumps	Rosebud Films Ltd.	"	13	30	
Lost!		CBC	1	100	
ENFANTS - ANGLAIS/CHILDREN - ENGLISH					
Michael's Fright	Productions La Fête Inc.	CFCF	1	120	86/03/31
Owl TV Series	Owl TV Inc.	CITY	10	27	85/09/15
Children's Festival (The) II	Heritage Festival Society	CBC	7	30	85/09/01
Edison Twins, cycles IV-V	Nelvana Ltd.	CBC	26	24	86/02/28
Elephant Show (The), Series II	Cambium Film & Video Productions Inc.	CBC	17	27.5	85/10/15
Kids of Ungrassy Street, Series V	Playing With Time Inc.	CBC	6	26	86/01/24
Vid Kids (The Series)	Wild Kids Productions Inc.	C.O.H. (Bushnell)	13	26	86/01/15
Jeunes musiques spécial	Silverscreen International Ltd.	CBC	1	60	85/09/30

TITRE/TITLE		Cie de production/Production Co.	Radiodiffuseur Broadcaster	Nbre d'épisodes No. of episodes	Durée approximative Approx. running time		Date d'achèvement Completion Date	
VARIÉTÉS ANGLAISES/VARIETY - ENGLISH								
En Scène 85: SRTQ - CITY TV	Spectel Video Inc.	SRTQ	6	90		85/09/01		
Frantics (The)	585164 Ontario Inc.	CBC	12	30		86/01/12		
Just for Laughs 85	Films Rozen Inc.	CBC	1	49		85/11/30		
National Heritage Festival	Point East Productions Inc.	CBC	1	60				
Dance Makes Waves	Media Cooperative Services Ltd.	CBC	1	55		85/08/15		
Kuan Yin Doll/Rita MacNeil	Red Snapper Films Ltd.	CBC	1	30		85/09/15		
Laughing Matters	Aptel Producers Corp.	Global	26	1		85/12/31		
National Arts Centre Presents	Mediapark Inc.	CBC	1	60		85/05/30		
Lifestyle Workout	SC Communications Ltd.	CHCH	1	24		85/11/30		
Big Shitick/Canadian Conspiracy	Shitick Productions Ltd.	CBC	1	60				
Global's Variety Special	M.G.T. Productions Inc.	Global	23	30		85/01/31		
Harvest Moon With Frank Mills	Olympic TV Productions Inc.	CBC	1	60		85/10/15		
K.D. Lang at Tsukuba	Robert Barclay Productions Inc.	CFCN	1	60				
DOCUMENTAIRES ANGLAIS/ENGLISH DOCUMENTARIES								
From Ape to Shakespeare	Snapshots Motion Pictures Inc.	TV Ontario	1	60		86/06/30		
Face to Face	Peak Productions	Global	1	30		85/09/13		
Jack McClelland: portrait...	Close-Up Film Productions	CBC	1	60		86/01/10		

APPENDIX D

Canadian Broadcast Program Development Fund: Sources of Funds (Financial Analysis)

- i. July 1, 1983 to March 31, 1984
- ii. April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1985
- iii. April 1, 1985 to October 31, 1985

Source: Tables provided to the authors by Telefilm Canada.

SOURCES OF FUNDS, JULY 1, 1983 to MARCH 31, 1984

CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUND - FONDS DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE LA PRODUCTION D'EMISSIONS CANADIENNES
FINANCIAL PARTICIPANTS - FINANCIAL ANALYSIS / ANALYSE FINANCIERE - PARTICIPANTS FINANCIERS

		ETAT DEM. / STAT. OF APPL		ENFANTS CHILDREN		DOCUMENTAIRE DOCUMENTARY		SCRIPT & DEV S-T FRANCAIS		SCRIPT & DEV S-T ENGLISH		TOTAL
		DRAMA	VARIETES									
		DRAMA	VARIETY									
AUTRE/OTHER	FRAN ENGL	250,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250,000	0	314,288
		64,288	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64,288	0	
CLS / S&G	FRAN ENGL	450,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450,000	0	850,000
		200,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200,000	0	
DIF/IND DEF	FRAN ENGL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522,874
		522,874	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522,874	0	
DISTRIBUT	FRAN ENGL	520,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520,000	0	900,000
		350,000	25,000	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	380,000	0	
INVEST PRIV	FRAN ENGL	384,763	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	384,763	0	1,275,763
		698,000	153,000	40,000	0	0	0	0	0	891,000	0	
TELE PAY TV	FRAN ENGL	1,680,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,680,000	0	2,520,000
		840,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840,000	0	
CDN PRIV.	FRAN ENGL	3,434,763	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,434,763	0	6,382,925
		2,675,162	178,000	45,000	0	0	0	0	0	2,898,162	0	

SOURCES OF FUNDS, JULY 1, 1983 to MARCH 31, 1984 (continued)

CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUND - FONDS DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE LA PRODUCTION D'EMISSIONS CANADIENNES
FINANCIAL PARTICIPANTS - FINANCIAL ANALYSIS / ANALYSE FINANCIERE - PARTICIPANTS FINANCIERS

		ETAT DEM.	VARIETES VARIETY	ENFANTS CHILDREN	DOCUMENTAIRE DOCUMENTARY	SCRIPT & DEV SCRIPT & DEV	S-T FRANCAIS S-T ENGLISH	TOTAL
AUTRE/OTHER	FRAN ENGL	1,089,994 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1,089,994 0	1,089,994
CO-PROD	FRAN ENGL	0 6,574,350	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 6,574,350	6,574,350
DISTRIEUT	FRAN ENGL	1,455,000 0	0 12,500	0 0	0 0	0 0	1,455,000 12,500	1,467,500
TELED/BROAD	FRAN ENGL	7,935,771 861,000	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	7,935,771 861,000	8,796,771
ETRANG/FOREIGN	FRAN ENGL	10,480,765 7,435,350	0 12,500	0 0	0 0	0 0	10,480,765 7,447,850	17,928,615

CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUND - FONDS DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE LA PRODUCTION D'EMISSIONS CANADIENNES
FINANCIAL PARTICIPANTS - FINANCIAL ANALYSIS / ANALYSE FINANCIERE - PARTICIPANTS FINANCIERS

		ETAT DEM. / STAT. OF APPL		DOCUMENTAIRE		SCRIPT & DEV		S-T FRANCAIS		S-T ENGLISH		TOTAL	
		DRAMA	VARIETES	ENFANTS	DOCUMENTAIRE	SCRIPT & DEV	SCRIPT & DEV	S-T FRANCAIS	S-T ENGLISH				
		DRAMA	VARIETY	CHILDREN	DOCUMENTARY								
GVT AUT/OTH	FRAN ENGL	496,125	0	0	0	0	0	0	496,125			496,125	
ONF/NFB	FRAN ENGL	1,865,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,865,000			2,968,389	
SGC	FRAN ENGL	1,016,667	0	668,800	0	0	0	0	1,685,467			1,685,467	
SUBV/GRANTS	FRAN ENGL	0	0	10,000	0	0	0	0	0			10,000	
GOUVERNEMENT	FRAN ENGL	3,377,792	0	668,800	0	0	0	0	4,046,592			5,159,981	
		1,103,389	0	10,000	0	0	0	0	1,113,389				

SOURCES OF FUNDS, JULY 1, 1983 to MARCH 31, 1984 (continued)

CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUND - FONDS DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE LA PRODUCTION D'EMISSIONS CANADIENNES									
FINANCIAL PARTICIPANTS - FINANCIAL ANALYSIS / ANALYSE FINANCIERE - PARTICIPANTS FINANCIERS									
E T A T D E M . / S T A T . O F A P P L									
	DRAMA	VARIETIES	ENFANTS	DOCUMENTAIRE	SCRIPT & DEV	S-T FRANCAIS	S-T ENGLISH		
	DRAMA	VARIETIES	CHILDREN	DOCUMENTARY	SCRIPT & DEV	S-T FRANCAIS	S-T ENGLISH		TOTAL
DIFF/DEF	FRAN	ENGL	FRAN	ENGL	FRAN	ENGL	FRAN	ENGL	
	208,446	93,700	319,654	0	0	533,840	93,700		677,540
	672,235	417,110	193,344	0	0	1,284,689	4,828,409		6,113,093
PRODUC	1,410,034	3,384,465	33,910	0	0	1,284,689	4,828,409		6,113,093
	830,481	472,870	514,998	0	0	1,863,549	4,922,109		6,790,659
PRODUC	1,503,734	3,384,465	33,910	0	0	1,863,549	4,922,109		6,790,659
AUTRE/OTHER	18,224,001	472,870	1,183,798	0	0	19,880,669	16,381,510		36,262,179
	12,717,635	3,574,965	88,910	0	0	16,381,510			

CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUND - FONDS DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE LA PRODUCTION D'EMISSIONS CANADIENNES
FINANCIAL PARTICIPANTS - FINANCIAL ANALYSIS / ANALYSE FINANCIERE - PARTICIPANTS FINANCIERS

PAGE 3

SOURCES OF FUNDS, JULY 1, 1983 to MARCH 31, 1984 (continued)

CANADIAN BROADCAST PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUND - FONDS DE DEVELOPEMENT DE LA PRODUCTION D'EMISSIONS CANADIENNES									
FINANCIAL PARTICIPANTS - FINANCIAL ANALYSIS / ANALYSE FINANCIERE - PARTICIPANTS FINANCIERS									
E T A T D E M . / S T A T . O F A P P L									
	DRAMA	VARIETES	ENFANTS	DOCUMENTAIRE	SCRIPT & DEV	S-T FRANCAIS	SCRIPT & DEV	S-T ENGLISH	TOTAL
	DRAMA	VARIETY	CHILDREN	DOCUMENTARY	SCRIPT & DEV	S-T FRANCAIS	SCRIPT & DEV	S-T ENGLISH	
SRC/CBC	FRAN ENGL	40,000 0	525,000 15,000	0 0	0 0	0 0	2,097,000 718,000	0 0	2,815,000
SRC/CBC REG	FRAN ENGL	0 15,000	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 15,000	0 0	15,000
PUBLIC	FRAN ENGL	1,532,000 718,000	525,000 15,000	0 0	0 0	0 0	2,097,000 733,000	0 0	2,830,000
TELED/BROAD	FRAN ENGL	2,298,119 1,783,671	525,000 270,948	0 0	0 0	0 0	2,894,119 2,372,632	0 0	5,266,751

LA PRODUCTION D'ÉMISSIONS FINANCIÈRES

ENCL
TOTAL (excluding Telefilm Investments and before adjustments)

EXPAND TOTAL